THE Nation

AMERICA'S LEADING LIBERAL WEEKLY SINCE 1865

VOLUME 154 NEW YORK · SATURDAY · MARCH 21, 1942 NUMBER 12

IN THIS ISSUE

THE SHAPE OF THINGS 325

EDITORIALS

Lend-Lease Results 328
The Poll Tax 329
The Puppet Axis *by Freda Kirchwey* 330

ARTICLES

Donald Nelson Has Chosen *by I. F. Stone* 331
Routes to Victory *by Donald W. Mitchell* 332
Coughlin's New Capital *by Donald Grant* 334
Headaches in Post-War Planning *by Maxwell S. Stewart* 336
Changes in Finland *by Maurice Feldman* 339
Everybody's Business *by Keith Hutchison* 340
In the Wind 341

BOOKS AND THE ARTS

Memo for Mr. Jarrell *by Rolfe Humphries* 342
The Sparrow Revolution *by Katherine Anne Porter* 343
Nazi-Ridden Rumania *by Rustem Vambery* 343
A New Poet *by Stephen Spender* 344
Britain and America *by Alexander Kiralfy* 345
Florida People *by Louis B. Salomon* 346
Authority and Liberty *by Reinhold Niebuhr* 347
In All Directions *by George Barker* 347
In Brief 348
Drama: A New Theory for J. M. B. *by Joseph Wood Krutch* 348
Records *by B. H. Haggin* 349

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS 351

Editor and Publisher
FREDA KIRCHWEY

Managing Editor ROBERT BENDINER
Washington Editor I. F. STONE
Literary Editor MARGARET MARSHALL

Associate Editors
KEITH HUTCHISON MAXWELL S. STEWART

Assistant Editor RICHARD H. ROVERE
Music Critic B. H. HAGGIN
Drama Critic JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH

Board of Contributing Editors
NORMAN ANGELL • JONATHAN DANIELS • LOUIS FISCHER
REINHOLD NIEBUHR • J. ALVAREZ DEL VAYO

Business Manager HUGO VAN ARX
Advertising Manager MARY HOWARD ELLISON

Published weekly and copyright, 1942, in the U. S. A. by The Nation, Inc., 55 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. Entered as second-class matter, December 13, 1879, at the Post Office of New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879. Washington Editorial Bureau: 856 National Press Building.

The Shape of Things

THE SUDDEN DRAMATIC SHIFT OF GENERAL Douglas MacArthur from his beleaguered outpost on Bataan Peninsula to supreme command of the Allied forces in the Pacific will have a tonic effect everywhere. His qualities of leadership, as well as his personal courage, have become an example throughout the United Nations and even among the forces of the Axis. The suicide of General Homma may be taken as a grim gesture of tribute to the man he could not conquer. General MacArthur cannot be asked to work similar miracles on the vast sprawling front of the southwestern Pacific. He cannot replace lost ships or fabricate bombing planes. But he can inspire the fighting Allies with a belief that final victory is inevitable and with a fighting spirit that has not always been evident. The change should be the signal for a new strategy of aggressive counter-attack.

✳

THE BATTLE OF THE JAVA SEA WAS A SEVERE defeat for the United Nations. Five cruisers, including the 10,000-ton Houston, are known to have been sunk, and the Japanese claim additional victims, among them the American cruisers Augusta and Marblehead. At least six destroyers and a sloop are also admitted to have gone down. Known Japanese losses were restricted to one cruiser and one destroyer, although several other ships are reported to have been badly hit and others may have been destroyed in the final engagement, from which there were no survivors from the United Nations' ships. Disheartening though the defeat is, it is evident that the Dutch, British, Australian, and American squadrons had no choice but to fight, even against overwhelming odds. The stakes were high. Surabaya, the last good naval base in the southern Pacific, had to be defended if possible. Victory, or a deadlock, would probably not only have saved Java but have disrupted the entire Japanese offensive. Although the Japanese are reported to have had a superiority of nine cruisers to five, this advantage might easily have been overcome by the use of land-based planes from Java. But if such planes were used, no mention of the fact is made in the official communiqués. This raises again the question of what became of the 1,500 planes that were supposed to be stationed in Java.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE MOST HOPEFUL ASPECT OF THE NEW British plan to secure India's cooperation in the war is the choice of the envoy who will present it to the Indian people. Sir Stafford Cripps is the one member of Churchill's Cabinet who can be regarded as an enthusiastic champion of Indian freedom, and his selection for this mission has been widely approved. Moreover, the fact that he volunteered to undertake the urgent and difficult task of consulting and negotiating with the Indian leaders must mean that the program formulated by the British Cabinet is something more than an eleventh-hour attempt to stall off trouble with vague promises. Even so, it will be almost a miracle if Cripps succeeds in inducing India to join whole-heartedly with the United Nations in resisting aggression. The fact that a settlement is sought only when Britain's hold over India is being threatened more seriously than ever before puts a premium on the demands of intransigent minorities. Ali Jinnah, president of the All-India Moslem League, has already threatened revolt if control of the Indian government is allowed to pass into the hands of the predominantly Hindu Congress Party. Jinnah may be bluffing, as Congress spokesmen seem to think, but in view of the ferments stirring the whole Moslem world and the fact that there are Moslem majorities not only in the Northwest Province but in Bengal and Assam, which adjoin Burma, his threats have to be taken seriously. Meanwhile we should feel happier about India if there were signs that responsible leaders were taking positive steps to resist Japanese aggression instead of waiting for Britain to confess its past crimes, as Mr. Gandhi suggests. They seem to forget that the immediate reason for defending India is not to save the British Empire but to save India itself from new conquest and worse exploitation.

*

THE RECENT RISE IN U-BOAT SINKINGS OFF the Atlantic coast has brought home once again the crucial nature of the shipping problem faced by the United Nations. Although details of necessity are withheld, it is no secret that the war in the South Pacific has greatly increased the shipping stringency. The loss of the oil-producing centers in the East Indies has added to the difficulty by making it necessary to ship large quantities of oil and gasoline over lines of communication that are some ten or twelve thousand miles long. Exact figures on construction and sinkings are lacking. But we know that American and British shipyards are each building at the rate of not more than one and a half million gross tons annually. Sinkings in the last half of 1941 were at the rate of approximately 2,200,000 tons annually, and have recently increased substantially. Thus it is obvious that construction is barely keeping pace with sinkings at a time when the demand for shipping for troop transport and provisioning has been greatly increased by developments in the Pacific. The immediate situation will not be helped by the fact that a very considerable increase in production is expected by late summer or early fall. Only one thing can help: the development of a strategy that will provide for the most efficient possible use of our limited shipping resources during the next few months.

*

THE R. A. F. HAS NOT WAITED FOR HITLER to open his spring offensive in the east to start its own drive against Nazi factories in Germany and the occupied countries. In addition to two attacks on plants in the Paris area there have been a number of heavy raids on Essen, Cologne, and Kiel, while frequent fighter sweeps along the Channel have taken a considerable toll in German machines at the expense of comparatively light British losses. British spokesmen promise that these attacks will be maintained and intensified. The mysterious Colonel V. Britton, broadcasting to the "enslaved peoples of occupied Europe," recently warned them "to get away from the factories." After giving details of the way the Nazis were using the industrial and mineral resources of France, Belgium, and Holland to strengthen their war machine he pointed out that in Germany good air-raid shelters are provided. "You should have them too," he said. "The R. A. F. is coming. Keep out of the way." Hard and steady bombing of German objectives will undoubtedly have a useful effect in disturbing production and in forcing Hitler to maintain large air forces in Western Europe. But there is an increasing tendency in Britain to question the efficiency of the high-level bomber as a decisive weapon unless enormous fleets can be employed almost continuously over a period of weeks. There is a belief too that the R. A. F. has neglected the dive bomber, which, in combination with armored ground forces, has again and again been proved a devastating means of attack. Planes of this type are not being made in Britain, but they are now being supplied from this country. Large numbers will be almost essential to the success of any effort to open up a new western front.

*

A NEW ATTEMPT IS BEING MADE BY THE Southern diehards in Congress to use the war as an excuse to abolish practically every gain made by labor under the New Deal. A few weeks ago a drive by Representative Smith of Virginia to suspend the forty-hour week for the duration was beaten back by a large majority. But now he has returned to the attack with legislative proposals which would not only abolish the legal forty-hour week "certainly for the duration of the war" but would abrogate all union contracts providing for a limited work week and for any form of union shop. Plainly this is not a plan to lengthen hours so much as one to reduce pay envelopes. Mr. Smith, it is true, tries to dis-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

guise the fact that his bills represent class legislation of the most blatant character by including provisions for turning back all net profits on government contracts in excess of 6 per cent of costs. This method of limiting profits is generally recognized as thoroughly unsatisfactory, since it encourages inflation of costs and unduly favors the business with a rapid turnover of capital. But even sound profits control will not justify efforts to beat down all labor standards. Mr. Smith and his associates assert that their proposals are being pushed forward by public clamor. They have yet to hear from the wage-earners, but they will.

✶

HITLER'S MEMORIAL DAY SPEECH WAS A fresh pack of old lies. He spoke of the war as a "dispute . . . forced upon us" and of "the preparation of our enemies"; we wish this last were true. He spoke eloquently of "the Bolshevik colossus, the cruel menace of which it is now recognized should not be allowed"; he disowned any interest in the rest of the world outside Europe; he even repeated the old saws about the Jewish conspiracy. He reproached the Russian winter but paid it the compliment of telling the truth about it. "It was weeks earlier than any experience or knowledge gained from scientific forecasts led us to expect, that winter set in upon us." He admitted a reversal but blamed it all on the weather, giving practically no credit to the Russian armies, which, we are told on reliable authority, also set in and are continuing to set in on the German heroes. Hitler demanded new and greater sacrifices of the German people and promised in return "a long and blessed peace." "A new world," he said, "is being forged." And who can doubt that Hitler's New Order will go down as the greatest forgery in history?

✶

THE NEWS THAT THE SWEDISH GOVERNMENT has suppressed a number of publications for printing stories reflecting on the Nazis is disturbing, especially at a time when German troops are being massed ostentatiously along the Baltic and Goebbels is conducting an anti-Swedish press campaign. It is true that another paper has been prosecuted almost simultaneously for calling Stalin "a mass murderer," and that the suppressions appear more severe than they actually were, since they only applied to one issue and were probably enforced only after the distribution had been completed. Nevertheless, the action has more than a faint odor of appeasement. It was prompted by accounts of tortures suffered in Nazi concentration camps by fourteen Norwegians who had escaped. The Swedish Minister of Justice says that these stories cannot be verified, but there is, unfortunately, every reason to suppose that they were true. No doubt Berlin objects to such facts being published, but the Stockholm government cannot be so naive as to think that paying heed to Berlin's protests will protect them from Nazi demands of a more serious nature. The only thing that will prevent the invasion of Sweden if and when Nazi strategy requires that step will be the certain belief in Berlin that the Swedes will fight and exact a high military price. Concessions on minor matters do not mean that Stockholm would capitulate to major demands, but they do encourage the Germans to believe that it would. That is one reason why appeasement is so dangerous. And another result not to be ignored is the depressing effect on public morale.

✶

WE SHIVER WHEN AMBASSADOR HENRI-HAYE declares very positively that Japan will not be permitted to take over Madagascar, and our alarm is intensified by Sumner Welles's apparent readiness to be satisfied by such "assurances." We have not forgotten, if the State Department has, how frequently Vichy's protests of determination to resist demands by the Axis have proved preludes to surrender. On February 23, 1941, an official spokesman in Vichy insisted that Japanese proposals for a settlement between Indo-China and Thailand involving extensive territorial concessions by France would be firmly rejected. "We still have our empire," he added, "and we are determined to fight anyone who might attack it." But it wasn't very long before Vichy did accept Tokyo's terms and thus paid the bribe which led Thailand to accept a junior partnership in Japan's aggression. In the summer of 1941 Vichy again talked big about resisting Japanese demands for military occupation of Indo-China, only to yield on the ground that the colony needed protection from the British. And let us not forget that by handing over Indo-China Vichy made a major contribution to the success of the Japanese in the southwestern Pacific. In the light of the record it would be gross folly to expect Vichy to defend Madagascar should Tokyo decide that its occupation was desirable. And that may happen any time, for the island has great strategic value as a base from which to attack United Nations shipping proceeding by way of the Cape to the Near East or India and to undertake military and naval operations against South Africa. The United Nations have every justification for trying to be first on the spot for once, but no action is likely so long as Washington continues a policy of appeasement which makes Vichy more valuable to the Axis as a "neutral" than it would be as an open ally.

✶

ONLY A DAUMIER COULD DO JUSTICE TO THE dramatic scene in the courtroom at Riom last week when Léon Blum made his magnificent speech in defense of the French Republic, the Front Populaire, and his conduct as their representative. In a four-hour speech he said that the Axis had started the war, he proclaimed himself a Jew and a Marxist, and he predicted that France would

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

once again be free. "During the last fifteen minutes," reads one report, "he held spellbound an audience not by any means prejudiced in his favor." We doubt that the French press printed as full an account of the proceedings as the reporters for the foreign press were allowed to send out, but we may be sure that Blum's words will find their way into every French home. Hardly less sensational was the defense of Daladier, who turned upon his accusers with a ferocity and an eloquence which reduced the ten judges and the rest of the courtroom to "absolute silence." His speech was followed by immediate adjournment. Berlin is furious at the turn the Riom trials have taken. They were designed to prove that the French Republic declared war on Germany on orders from Britain; they have brought forth instead a sensational indictment of Hitler and his Vichy satellites. It is reported that the German government is about to seize upon the procedure at Riom as an excuse for "revision" of Franco-German relations. It would be ironical indeed if, thanks to the courage of Blum and Daladier, the men of Vichy should be deprived even of their pretense of independence.

*

THE INDIGNATION AROUSED IN THE BRITISH and American press by Secretary Eden's revelation of Japanese atrocities at Hongkong is justified; but it is, to say the least, ironical that anger over Japan's treatment of its victims should have been so long delayed. There was no reason to expect that the residents of Hongkong would be treated any less cruelly than the residents of Soochow, Kiukiang, Hangchow, and Nanking—unless it be the one suggested in Mr. Eden's remarkable statement that the atrocities were perpetrated "without distinction of race or color." The racial arrogance implied in this remark provides a perfect basis for Japan's appeal for Asiatic solidarity against white domination. The Japanese have been guilty of vastly greater arrogance, as well as unspeakable barbarism, in their relations with conquered peoples, but such statements as that of Mr. Eden give them the advantage of being able to trade on the sins of their predecessors.

*

ALTHOUGH MARTIN DIES IS UNPOPULAR with most members of the House, his Committee to Investigate un-American Activities has been extended for another year and will probably get another $100,000 to pay its expenses. The vote for extension was 331 to 46. Chairman Sabath of the Rules Committee, John M. Coffee (Democrat) of Washington, and Joseph Clark Baldwin (Republican) from the New York City "silk-stocking district," with Eliot and Marcantonio, were among the few who had the courage to attack the Texas demagogue. Sabath asked that the Dies committee be abolished because it had failed to investigate "the real Fascists and Nazis in the United States." Coffee declared that Fritz Kuhn, William Dudley Pelley, and George Deatherage had all at one time or another warmly indorsed the work of the Dies committee. Baldwin proposed that the job of exposing fifth-column influences be left to the FBI. The moral to be drawn from the vote is that if the Dies committee is not to go on with its un-American activity forever, its opponents will have to begin the work of fighting it much earlier than they did this time. We suggest the formation of a National Committee to Send Dies Back Where He Came From which should begin work now on the task of defeating him when his inevitable request for an extension comes up next year.

*

OFFICIALS OF THE WAR PRODUCTION BOARD seem curiously indifferent to the survey made by Joseph W. Frazer, president of Willys-Overland. Frazer, head of the first automobile company to be converted to arms production, did what WPB officials should have done. He sent out a questionnaire in January to dealers all over the country, and on the basis of returns from the first 10 per cent he estimates that they have idle facilities and floor space equal to an arms factory ten miles square. There are 40,000 of these dealers, and to judge from these first returns they have about 18,000 lathes, 15,000 grinders, 1,400 shapers, 16,000 drills, 52,000 welders, 40,000 buffers, 1,600 screw machines, and 4,200 sprays which could be brought into war work under a "bits-and-pieces" program. The only way to make use of them would seem to be to pass some such legislation as the Murray bill now before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. This would establish a government corporation which would act as a prime contractor and break down arms blueprints into "bits and pieces" for small shops of this kind. It would also act as a finance company, providing funds for raw materials and wages in order to get work under way. Donald M. Nelson has expressed himself in favor of the bill. The principal obstacle seems to be Jesse Jones.

Lend-Lease Results

THE isolationists who have been quick to blame Britain for its failure to invade the Continent and for the tragic collapse of the United Nations in the South Pacific should study carefully the report of the first year of American lend-lease efforts. While the President's report on a full year's operation shows some gain in recent months, the results as a whole constitute a powerful indictment of American sloth and complacency in the months preceding our entry into the war. In twelve months our total exports of lend-lease supplies to Great Britain, Russia, China, and the other Allies were valued at only $1,100,000,000. Just how much of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this was made up of foodstuffs and raw materials and how much of planes, tanks, and weapons of war is not revealed. But we know from previous reports and from the agricultural supplies listed that food alone comprised at least $400,000,000. It is evident, therefore, that only a small proportion of the total could have consisted of fighting equipment. In addition, there were, of course, considerable expenditures from lend-lease funds for the servicing, rental, and repair of ships, and for production facilities within the United States. The total expenditures for all purposes reached $2,500,000,000, which is but a minute fraction of the $48,000,000,000 which has been appropriated for lend-lease purposes.

Food, raw materials, ships, and repair facilities are important to the war effort of the United Nations. And the very real difficulties which the Administration has confronted in obtaining adequate production of planes, tanks, and other combat weapons should not be minimized. But it is perfectly clear that Britain could not possibly have hoped to stage an effective offensive on the basis of the supply of weapons contributed by the United States in the past twelve months. A year ago, when the lend-lease program was in its initial stages, we estimated that American exports of war materials to Britain would have to average $1,000,000,000 a month in order to balance the productive resources of Germany and the occupied areas of Europe. This, of course, took no account of the requirements of Russia or China. Actually, our aggregate contribution to the United Nations was about one-fifth of Britain's needs alone. In relation to needs, it has unquestionably been proportionately less to Russia and China.

It is evident that no small share of the responsibility for our failure to live up to the promise of lend-lease rests on the shoulders of the Administration. Our production for 1941 in no way approached either our capacity or our responsibilities. For this Knudsen, the OPM, and the whole policy of business-as-usual must be blamed. But the share of the isolationists in our failure must not be forgotten. They not only fought a delaying action against the lend-lease plan when it was before Congress, but through opposition to the turning over of existing American ships and war supplies greatly reduced the amount of effective aid which we could deliver last summer and fall. One hesitates to think, for example, what effect it might have had on the course of the war if a few hundred American army and navy fighter planes had been turned over to Britain for use in Singapore and the South Pacific. Perhaps Britain would not have used the planes for this purpose. If that had been the case, the responsibility for the defeats in that area could rightfully be placed on the shoulders of the British. But under existing circumstances the United States must take the major share of the blame. We simply haven't delivered the goods.

The Poll Tax

LIKE the fight against slavery before it, the fight against the poll tax is a fight to save the North and the rest of the country from the power wielded in Congress by a small and reactionary Southern oligarchy. The power of this oligarchy, once based on black slaves, is based today in large part on voteless men and women, white as well as black. An examination of Congressional committee chairmanships will show the extent to which these bodies are dominated by men who can return to Congress year after year because a majority of the voters in their states or districts are disfranchised. Northern big business is relying more and more on these "unrepresentatives" to pass reactionary measures which could not win the approval of a democratic electorate. Ten of the thirty-three standing committees in the Senate are headed by men from the eight poll-tax states, most of them men of the extreme right. These ten are Byrd, of Virginia, Rules; Glass, of Virginia, Appropriations; George, of Georgia, Finance; Connally, of Texas, Foreign Relations; Smith, of South Carolina, Agriculture and Forestry; Russell, of Georgia, Immigration; Bankhead, of Alabama, Immigration and Reclamation; Caraway, of Arkansas, Enrolled Bills; McKellar, of Tennessee, Post Office and Roads; and Hill, of Alabama, Expenditures of Executive Departments. Of the ten, only Hill can be counted a progressive.

In the House twelve of the forty-four standing committees have chairmen from the poll-tax states: Fulmer, of South Carolina, Agriculture; Steagall, of Alabama, Banking and Currency; Ramspeck, of Georgia, Civil Service; McGehee, of Mississippi, Claims; Whittington, of Mississippi, Flood Control; Sumners, of Texas, Judiciary; Bland, of Virginia, Merchant Marine and Fisheries; Vinson, of Georgia, Naval Affairs; Lanham, of Texas, Public Roads and Grounds; Mansfield, of Texas, Rivers and Harbors; Rankin, of Mississippi, World War Veterans; and Jarman, of Alabama, Printing. A few of these occasionally turn up on the progressive side of an issue, but most of them are thoroughly reactionary.

The poll tax, by cutting down the number of voters, gives these men a permanence in Congress that men from other districts can rarely achieve. This fact in combination with the seniority system gives them key positions in the machinery of Congress. The committee chairmen wield great power over legislation, and thus the entire country may find itself governed by men who represent few people even in their own districts.

Since its adoption by Florida in 1889 the poll tax has become the principal Southern device for disfranchising the poor white as well as the Negro. It is time we realized that it disfranchises indirectly the rest of us as well.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Puppet Axis

BY FREDA KIRCHWEY

ARGENTINA has made a trade pact with Spain. It will largely increase its exports of wheat, meat, and other foodstuffs in exchange for "manufactured goods, machinery, and chemical products." The pact also provides for the establishment of an air route between Madrid and Buenos Aires, though the plans for that have not been perfected yet. Our State Department hopes—for hoping is an essential by-product of appeasement—that the air line won't materialize. It knows that an air line from Spain to Argentina would be either a German or an Italian enterprise since Spain has no means, financial or industrial, to start air lines. But shipping facilities will certainly be increased, and goods will begin to flow to Spain, and thence—? Well, it is hoped in Washington that Argentina's wheat and beef will not feed the armies of Adolf Hitler. But if they should, what could the United States do about it? It would hardly be good form even to ask Acting President Castillo or Generalissimo Franco where those foodstuffs were going. Both are neutrals in the war, and both are friends of the United States.

It wouldn't be polite, and yet when Archibald MacLeish, chief of the Office of Facts and Figures, announced the other day that the Japanese embassy in Madrid was using "technically neutral Spain" as headquarters for propaganda against the United States, a fleeting wonder must have passed through the minds of our policy-makers. What, they must have asked themselves with puckered brow, what the hell is Spain's fake neutrality worth anyhow? And they may have recalled the fact that Nazi agents in several Latin American countries, instead of packing up their short-wave sets and heading for home after the Rio conference, are carrying on political warfare as usual through Franco's embassies and consulates. An instance was revealed just the other day through the arrest in Rio of a Nazi spy. The spy, one Walter Menze, gave the office a report of his activities in the course of which he said, "This month I received money from the hands of Herr Klock, formerly of the German embassy, who now works as a member of the auxiliary staff of the Spanish embassy." The report was printed in *O Globo* of Rio on February 19, in case the State Department would like to check it. Another employee of the dissolved German embassy staff in Rio has also moved over to Franco headquarters; his name is von Cassel. But Vargas is our friend—an even closer friend than Castillo—and so it is unlikely that the State Department will inquire how it happens that Señor Raimundo Fernandez Cuesta, the Spanish ambassador in Rio, now shelters under his neutral wing Nazi diplomats who Mr. Welles fondly hoped would be ousted when Brazil ended its relations with Germany last month. Fernandez Cuesta, incidentally, was one of the chief organizers of the Spanish Phalanx.

The State Department may find some satisfaction in Vargas's decision to place German and Italian property in the care of a custodian following the sinking of four Brazilian ships by Axis U-boats. Perhaps, too, it is pleased by the overwhelming popular feeling against the Axis which took the form of riots and mob attacks on German stores in Rio de Janeiro. But the Brazilian government has announced that for the present it has no intention of either arming ships or declaring war. The dictator has solemnly proclaimed a state of emergency so that he may exercise full executive powers; but since he has exercised them right along anyhow, the gesture is not impressive. For all his large pretensions of solidarity with the United States and the Allied cause, he will play a game of watchful waiting just as long as he can. Democratic Brazilians living in New York are convinced that the riots were as much aimed at Vargas and the pro-Nazis in his government as at the Axis.

As for Castillo, his new pact with Franco links him even more closely than before to Hitler. The delegation sent by the Franco government to arrange the details of the accord is headed by a prominent member of the Spanish Phalanx, Eduardo Aunós, who knows Argentina well and can be trusted to do a good job for his masters in Madrid and Berlin. For Hitler has moved quickly and intelligently to take advantage of the chief loophole in the Rio agreement—Castillo's refusal to break off relations with the Axis. Argentina's trade agreement with Spain is Hitler's answer to Rio. By one masterly stroke Franco is assured of relief, the Axis of new sources of necessary foodstuffs, and the Argentine producers of grain and meat of a market for their surpluses. An important breach is made in the British blockade of Europe, while Argentina becomes an even more active center of Nazi intrigue in this hemisphere. The River Plate is an open mouth leading into the body of South America. Ships that take food to Spain can carry back fresh supplies of Nazi agents and of propaganda material for the Phalanx to distribute throughout the continent.

It is said in Washington that Mr. Welles is worried about the Phalanx and is "watching" it. But while Mr. Welles watches, the Phalanx works. In Mexico, for example, according to a dispatch by Harold Callender printed in the New York *Times* last Sunday, the Phalanx is financed by Spanish nationals to the extent of 200,000 pesos a month. Mexican officials consider it more important as an agent of the Axis than the German colony itself, "for the Phalangists speak the language of Mexico and can more readily conceal their anti-American activities." "These Spaniards," says Mr. Callender, "can travel to and from the United States. [This is a curious fact in view of the State Department's refusal to permit

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Spanish Republicans even to pass through the United States on their way to Mexico.] One is said to have made recently an extensive tour of American factories and to have sent a report to General Franco. The Phalanx is even believed to have a military section. Its leaders do not conceal their sympathy for the Axis; yet Spanish Fascists are not technically members of the Axis and cannot be lumped with other Axis agents by the authorities. This naturally enhances their value to their masters." But nobody in Mexico, or in Washington, knows what to do about the Phalanx, according to Mr. Callender, because Spain is not an Axis power.

The sham neutrality of Spain and its diplomatic relations with the United States make possible all these pro-Axis maneuvers. The failure of appeasement is evident; what ordinary Americans cannot understand is the refusal of their government—a war-time government—to abandon this disastrous policy.

Donald Nelson Has Chosen

BY I. F. STONE

Washington, March 15

THE destiny of the American people remains in flabby hands. The navy is still losing ships and the dollar-a-year men are still losing time. The losses off Java, added to the losses at Pearl Harbor, bring closer the day when foreign troops may set foot on our soil, but too many of the men in key positions here do not actually realize that there is a war on. The resignation of Robert R. Guthrie as head of the War Production Board's textile, clothing, and leather-goods division indicates how little difference the change in name from OPM to WPB, the speeches of Nelson, and the Pearl Harbor disaster have made.

Guthrie goes because industrial mobilization under Donald M. Nelson is still in the hands of men who do not want to mobilize industry, who want to go on making radios and refrigerators and washing machines and typewriters and carpets. When Nelson became head of the War Production Board he said, "Heads will roll." But the first to tumble is that of one of the few dollar-a-year men here whose heart was in an all-out effort. In a conflict between an all-outer and the business-as-usual crowd, Nelson let the latter win, accorded Guthrie the scantiest hearing. I hope the Truman committee will give this affair a thorough airing so that the country can judge for itself whether Nelson has what it really takes to do the job.

Nelson is a very fine and likable man, modest and sincere, open to suggestion and criticism, genuinely devoted to his country. There is much already to chalk up in his favor. He forced through the plan for labor-management production committees last week over last-minute objections from the War and Navy departments; both are dominated by the mentality of the National Association of Manufacturers and regard these committees literally as part of a plan to "Sovietize America." Nelson's appointment of Robert R. Nathan, Thomas Blaisdell, and Fred Searles as a three-man planning board and overseeing eye is one of the most encouraging moves made in production in some time. Searles is a conservative from the ranks of industry, Nathan and Blaisdell are young New Dealers, but all three are all-outers. Nelson has begun on the heartbreaking task of infiltrating new men and new ideas into the Army-Navy procurement services, whose conventional-minded attitude is one of the most serious obstacles to the war effort. These steps all represent the beginning, though only the beginning, of progress. If it were not for the terrible tempo of events, we could afford to sit back with patience and wait for results.

Unfortunately time is with the Axis. In the East the Japanese are accomplishing in weeks what it will take years of fighting to undo. This spring will see a gigantic effort by Berlin and Tokyo to encircle Britain, Russia, and the United States and cut them off from one another. In this context the rate of industrial mobilization is dreadfully sedate. A glance back at the dates is instructive. Pearl Harbor was bombed on December 8. It was not until January 20 that Nelson ordered automobile production ended by February 1. Much of the force was taken from this order two days later when the War Production Board allowed automobile manufacturers to triple last year's production of parts during the first half of this year. Parts production will not end until June 30. On January 23 the WPB further weakened the drive for conversion of the industry by permitting the manufacturers to build 34 per cent more trucks this March than in March of last year.

Even slower has been the move toward mobilization of other major consumer-goods industries which have been absorbing strategic materials and using machines that can be turned to war work. It was not until February 23 that production of domestic mechanical refrigerators was ordered discontinued. The order does not take effect until April 30, and "nothing in this order shall be construed to prohibit or limit the production of replacement

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

parts." So long as the companies can go on making parts, they will be half-hearted about conversion.

Last year the radio and phonograph industry consumed 2,100 tons of aluminum, 10,500 tons of copper, 290 tons of nickel, and 70,000 tons of steel. But it was not until March 7, three months after Pearl Harbor, that the WPB finally ordered manufacture of radios and phonographs discontinued. The order does not take effect until April 22, and the industry will not cease production entirely for some time after that. It may complete radio sets on which it began assembly work "on or before April 22," and after the assembly work is finished it may go on making parts. The washing-machine industry is another that is consuming materials which literally mean lives. Yet it was not until March 12 that the WPB issued a "proposed order" which would end production of washing machines by large manufacturers on April 15 and by small manufacturers on May 15. Here, again, they may go on making parts.

These are dry and humdrum details, but I do not apologize for dwelling on them. Materials which should be going into tanks and planes and guns, machines which could be turning out armament, are involved. In the prosaic words of these orders is the cryptogram where freedom's future may already be written. Wars are not won by this dilatory, half-hearted kind of industrial mobilization. Continued production of radios and refrigerators and washing machines and of a whole list of consumer goods yet to be banned is a crime against the people of this country and their allies, and it is a crime which must rest ultimately on the conscience of Donald M. Nelson. Why does he permit it?

Nelson's code for dollar-a-year men is a farce. He has said that no dollar-a-year man will be permitted to pass on matters affecting his own company, but they pass all the time on matters affecting their own industries. Guthrie, a conservative business man who soon found himself allied only with Hillman's labor people and Henderson's brain trusters, won the hatred of the industry crowd because of his fight for conversion. Though a quarrel with greedy textile interests seems to have been the immediate cause of his going, the most important enemy he made was Philip D. Reed, chief of the Bureau of Industry Branches and chairman of the board of General Electric. General Electric makes radios, and Guthrie's leadership in the fight to end production of radios was the real beginning of his downfall. This is the second time that Reed has played a part in obstructing the war effort in the interests of his own industry. As William L. Batt's deputy in the old materials branch, he fought expansion of steel and aluminum, and he should have been sent back to his board of directors long ago. The disturbing part of the Guthrie affair is that it was Reed and not Guthrie who won Nelson's support.

Industrial mobilization, as run by the Reeds, is full of loopholes. The WPB still does not know the full amount of the precious raw materials hoarded in the inventories of industry. Production of planes is retarded by lack of aluminum, and production of tanks is retarded by lack of steel plates, but there is no will ruthlessly to invade the stockpiles of big business and make hidden metals available for war. What we have in the WPB is "self-regulation" of business with all its inevitable evils, the same subordination of our country's safety to private interests that helped ruin France. Must the Japs land before we wake up?

Routes to Victory

BY DONALD W. MITCHELL

WITH the conquest of Java Japan completed another step in its progress toward hegemony of the Pacific. The vital areas of the western Pacific and eastern Asia are now all in its hands. Although its conquests have not been consolidated and guerrilla resistance may be bothersome for some time, Japan has already won the main battle. Yet notwithstanding the disastrous and prestige-shattering defeats they have suffered, the United Nations have not lost the war. How, then, can they turn their defeats into ultimate victory?

By driving a wedge through the war area Japan has split the Allied forces into two segments, and by reason of its control of the Indies and Malaya, enjoys a stronger strategic position than ever before. It now can turn its attention either to the south against Australia or to the west against India, or in both directions at once. In the approaching Battle for India the United States is not in a position to give large-scale aid. We have already sent technical advisers and are dispatching planes to bolster the somewhat shaky air superiority which the British have in Burma. Arms for large bodies of native troops probably represent a more profitable expenditure of merchant tonnage than would the transport of American troops. Of course we should be prepared greatly to increase our naval pressure against Japan should it withdraw large naval units for use in the Indian Ocean.

The defense of Australia and other British islands in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the southwestern Pacific, on the other hand, should be regarded as definitely the responsibility of the United States. It will not be an easy task. Fighting planes and, very soon, gasoline will have to be transported by one of the longest lines of supply anywhere in the world. This line, however, has been rather well guarded by the establishment of bases in the months since December 7. And a considerable stiffening of Australia's depleted man-power by American troops has probably also been achieved; so far as possible the necessary food and other supplies for these men should be furnished by their host country in order to conserve shipping.

The United States cannot make its defense of Australia air tight because, if for no other reason, too much has already been lost elsewhere. The wild tropical coast of northern Australia, including Port Darwin, may easily be in Japanese hands by the time this article appears in print. The western coast is only less vulnerable. But southern and southeastern Australia, containing the bulk of the population, the industrial regions, and the sources of food supply should prove defensible. The United States had a three months' start in sending forces to this area, and southern Australia's enormous distance from Japan presents the enemy also with a hard problem in logistics. Further, American sea power can operate here without danger of aerial attacks from nearby bases; this risk apparently scared us out of trying to put naval reinforcements in the East Indies.

It would probably prove a mistake, nevertheless, to base our main Pacific war effort on Australia. Not only does it lack the necessary naval bases, but more important, to strike at the mainland of Japan effectively from the south would require us to undertake an intensely hard and expensive campaign in which, operating without adequate bases and against a better-armed enemy, we should have to reconquer everything previously lost. Australia must be defended as a source of supplies for sea and air raiders, but if it is possible we should get at Japan by some nearer way and force it to meet the unexpected rather than fight the type of war it chooses.

Two other routes of attack exist. Dutch Harbor in the Aleutians is only 1,400 miles from the nearest Japanese islands. The Great Circle route across the northern Pacific is thus the shortest road to Japan. To attack along this line we should have to capture and garrison bases across the northern Pacific much as Japan did in moving south. The initial steps would probably not be strenuously opposed, but as we approached the population centers of Japan we would be sure to encounter increasingly powerful resistance.

This northern route has the advantage of short distance, but it also has several drawbacks. Dutch Harbor is not a real naval base, and completely adequate facilities are not to be found nearer than Hawaii; the weather is extremely bad during a large part of the year; save for fisheries, Japan has few vital interests in the Far North. But the greatest difficulty is our need for better air-base facilities than those afforded by barren volcanic islands. Russia's Siberian bases, almost essential for success in this enterprise, will probably not be made available until our aid in Europe has started the decline of Hitler.

The most promising route by which to attack the Japanese islands lies immediately west of Hawaii. Our raids in the Marshalls and Gilberts, though intended to eliminate possible interference with the American transport line to New Zealand and Australia, probably had as a secondary objective the feeling out of some of the more formidable of the Japanese "stationary airplane carriers" which bar the way through the central Pacific. These islands would have to be captured, garrisoned, and developed as American outposts prior to any attempt to bring American sea and air power into reasonable proximity to Japan. It is a process that can be started from the south as well as the east, and the reduction of the Marshall and Caroline groups would at the same time make our southern supply lines much more secure. A successful campaign through the Pacific would put us in possession of island bases within comfortable bombing range of Japanese cities and especially Japanese lines of communication with the south. At some point in such a campaign we could confidently expect a decisive test of strength with the Japanese fleet. American victory would bring naval and air dominance and as a corollary the ability to recover territories previously lost. Even defeat could scarcely make the Allied position worse than it is now, with all initiative and control of the scene of operations in Japanese hands.

A serious Allied offensive presupposes several conditions. Both naval and air superiority are absolutely essential to success. Merchant shipping is an equally vital factor, since the transportation and supply of troops make enormous demands. We must also choose whether to take the offensive in the Pacific or in other theaters of war, since we are not prepared to launch attacks all along the line. Lastly, but this is vital, we must have sufficient moral toughness to pay the price of war, to risk heavy losses in return for valuable gains. It is an attribute which the Japanese have displayed markedly in this war.

Even if we cannot undertake a full-scale attack immediately, we should still employ offensive tactics. The naval and aerial attrition suffered by the Japanese has already been heavy. It must be maintained and extended to other areas closer to Japan proper. Because our bases are closer to the Japanese islands than Japan's are to our Pacific coast, we have an immense advantage in this type of war. Air raids can be made from carriers if we are willing to run risks. However, raids are at best a stopgap while we gather strength for a more serious effort.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Coughlin's New Capital

BY DONALD GRANT

Boston, March 15

BUNKER HILL, the Old North Church, and all the other proud relics of a time when a fierce love of freedom and democracy was flowering in New England take on an ironic symbolism these days as the poison of Nazism drifts through the crooked streets of Boston like a fog from the bay.

Before Pearl Harbor the Christian Front flourished among the Irish of South Boston, and America First found a blessing in the Back Bay. Occasionally the two met, as when an aristocratic dowager offered aid and comfort to Francis P. Moran, dapper young leader of the Christian Front. Moran held weekly meetings in Hibernian Hall, Roxbury, pounding Nazi propaganda down the throat of anyone who could be dragged in by the young toughs of the Christian Front. He showed the Nazi propaganda film "Victory in the West" more than once, with appropriate admonitions that all American boys in the army be told how impossible it was to stop the great German war machine. He cheered Lindbergh, cursed the Jews, and carried on campaigns to influence Congress with the aid of the franked envelopes of Senator D. Worth Clark, Senator Burton K. Wheeler, and Representative Stephen A. Day.

The Coughlin weekly, *Social Justice,* and the Brooklyn *Tablet* were sold at these meetings, as were the paper-bound volumes published by George Sylvester Viereck, recently convicted as a Nazi agent, under the imprint of Flanders Hall. When Moran turned his files over to the Boston police department, he still had 8,000 unsold Flanders Hall books. Also in his files were some interesting correspondence with Father Coughlin, Japanese propaganda, hundreds of propaganda leaflets published by the German Library of Information, and evidence of active collaboration with such notorious characters as George E. Deatherage of the Knights of the White Camellia, William Dudley Pelley of the Silver Shirts, Mrs. Elizabeth Dilling of the "Red Network," Charles B. Hudson, and Robert Edward Edmondson.

Moran was one of the first to run for cover after Pearl Harbor. Boston newspapers printed a few timid reports of Christian Front activities, and Moran agreed, at the request of Police Commissioner Joseph F. Timilty, to suspend his meetings. Since then he has devoted his time to the rather menial task of whipping up Boston circulation for *Social Justice,* which continues to be the chief inspiration of all the little Führers in America. The paper is hawked outside every Catholic church in the city, and 10,000 copies, it is estimated, are sold every week in the Boston area.

No one, however, should imagine that the defeatists in Boston—Irish or Yankee—became convinced of their error on December 7. On January 31 the Reverend Edward Lodge Curran of Brooklyn, spokesman for Father Coughlin in the East and friend of the Brooklyn Christian Front leader John F. Cassidy, came to Boston. When Moran attracted 500 people to his meetings he was doing very well. Father Curran, speaking under the auspices of the Knights of Columbus, drew an audience of 1,200 at Boston's Hyde Park High School. And instead of Christian Front toughs—or rather in addition to the old Christian Front crowd—Father Curran was flanked by two Boston priests, several important business men, and representatives of local units of the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars.

His words, however, were the same old Christian Front line, slightly touched up for the occasion. The old isolationists—Lindbergh, Wheeler, Nye, Fish—were warmly defended; England and Russia were scorned; our own national leadership was ridiculed and discredited. The new emphasis was on the current press criticism of civilian defense. After repeating some of the more extreme instances, with elaborations, Curran demanded that our armed forces be brought back from the areas of conflict to protect our own shores.

This suggestion was to have an interesting sequel. The Boston *Herald,* through its featured columnist Bill Cunningham, was the next to raise the cry for home defense. Editorially, the *Herald,* both before and after Pearl Harbor, has strongly supported the war effort. Even now it regularly prints a "rumor clinic," which dissects the kind of half-truth about the war that is found frequently in Cunningham's column. The explanation lies in the fight for circulation in Boston's crowded newspaper field, which has led to some odd twists in *Herald* policies. The big morning circulation in Boston goes to the *Post,* which has its stakes deep in the Irish districts of South Boston and Charlestown. To get some of this circulation the *Herald* hired, at what is reported to be a fancy salary, the *Post's* sports columnist, Mr. Cunningham. Then the war broke out, and Cunningham became overnight an authority on grand strategy; his column appeared on the front page in the Sunday edition. There he beat his chest with super-patriotism but at the same time interlarded his fervor with poisonous bits of sucker bait for the dissenting Irish. Sometimes his column adjoined the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Herald's "rumor clinic," but that didn't prevent Cunningham from including sly insinuations that he knew many dark secrets about the war. "I can write you a Pearl Harbor story that will turn your blood to ice water," he said. And "I heard a naval story concerning Boston harbor that would literally curl your hair."

On February 15 Cunningham described the New England coast as defenseless, with the German fleet just over a black horizon. He added:

> You ask, "What can I do?" . . .
> As an American and Bostonian you could register a ringing demand with your Congressman that something be done to give this city and nation of yours some protection.

Two days later Senator David I. Walsh made the following statement on the floor of the United States Senate:

> Yesterday and today my office has been flooded with letters from people in Massachusetts calling my attention to a newspaper article published in the Sunday press in which there was a dramatic exposé of the complete lack of necessary defenses for the city of Boston and the Massachusetts coast. It has stirred up the people in my section of the country. . . . I regret to have to say to them in reply that their plight is different only in degree from that of any other coastal city in the United States. . . . The day may come when we may have to bring back from the four corners of the world our depleted navy to be a source of defense for our own shores.

On the following Sunday Cunningham boasted in the *Herald* of having inspired Senator Walsh. The next day, February 23, Axis radio announcers repeated Senator Walsh's remarks with glee, and the Axis campaign to arouse a fear-born demand in America to recall our fleet from the combat zones was backed by a Japanese submarine attack on the West Coast. For the time being the attempt has failed. As the Japanese raider was shelling our coast, President Roosevelt told the American people that we would continue to carry the fight to the enemy wherever he could be found.

Boston defeatism, however, has not been downed. Father Curran returned to Boston on March 3, this time under the auspices of the Central Council of Irish Clubs, made up of people who trace their descent from ancestors in particular counties of Ireland. The meeting was held at the Hotel Bradford, and nearly 3,000 people attended. Sitting on the platform and applauding loudly were the Acting Mayor of Boston, the Mayor of Cambridge, a good number of Catholic priests—and the former doorkeeper of the now discontinued Christian Front meetings. Senator Walsh wasn't able to come, but he sent a telegram expressing regrets that he couldn't share the platform with "my very great friend, Dr. Edward Lodge Curran."

After a long oratorical denunciation of our allies, the Russians and the "totalitarian British," Curran developed the theme that we should keep our fighting forces at home. He felt sorry for MacArthur (*Social Justice* also sheds this tear), warned both labor and industry that the government was taking away their rights, said communism was the true enemy, and spoke with the bitterest scorn of the "four freedoms." His anti-Semitism was there, but it was veiled behind careful words. This was not a Christian Front meeting but a more subtle attempt to broaden the base of obstructionism.

A new theme, the glories of the "Irish race" and the need to keep alive the bitter memories of that "race," was merely suggested by Curran; its expansion was left to one of his Brooklyn henchmen, John Connolly, who was introduced as a representative of the Irish county groups in New York. The Irish, Connolly said, must stand as a "race" inside the American nation and as a "race" demand recognition and rights. It sounded like the Sudeten Germans talking in Prague, but Connolly kept a straight face. He said that plans were brewing for a national convention of the "Irish race" and that further announcements would be made later.

As I write, Father Curran is once more to the fore in Boston; this time as chief speaker on a program celebrating the anniversary of the evacuation of Boston by the British during the Revolutionary War. His appearance on this semi-official program drew vigorous protests from many Boston people, including members of the American-Irish Defense Association, trade unions, the American Defense-Harvard Group, and various church and civic organizations. The Veterans of Foreign Wars refused to participate in the program with Curran.

The reason why Boston has been tapped for the honor of leading the fight against the fight for freedom isn't hard to find. In the Boston area are half a million men, women, and children of Irish descent. In Ireland their ancestors were not always treated with consideration by the British, and when the Irish came to New England they met stiff stares from the descendants of the earlier emigrants from the United Kingdom. Boston Yankees continued to take the rich economic cream and to leave the skim milk to the newcomers. But an Irishman, given half a chance—and the Boston Irish have had considerably more than that—knows what to do in such a situation. Some of the Boston Irish have become so prosperous they have begun to act like Yankees. Many are poor, very poor. But any politician who doesn't make his obeisance to the shamrock in Boston just doesn't go to town on Election Day.

Why, then, this discontent on Boston Common? The answer goes back to Coughlin and Curran and Moran, and the constant stream of propaganda to which the Irish have been subjected. That the propagandists of the Axis are attempting to exploit the Irish Catholic minority

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in America in order to divide us cannot be doubted. Who consciously is furthering this design for conquest, and who is being driven along as a screen for the enemy, will come out at some later day.

Actually, as the Gallup poll shows, the vast majority of Irish Americans are so whole-heartedly committed to the war effort that they think Eire is wrong in its refusal to let British and American soldiers use Irish bases to guard Irish freedom. A clear majority think Ireland should go so far as to join the war and fight for its own freedom. The average American of Irish descent would be a lot happier if he were left alone to fight the Nazi enemy as an American, unchecked by the confusion-mongering Coughlinites. That some old Beacon Hill Yankees have descended from their America First dais to play a part in the Irish county associations is a side-show about which we can afford to laugh, after the war is won. No self-respecting Irish American would listen to the high-hat America First crowd for a minute if their chatter didn't sound so much like Father Coughlin's.

For Father Coughlin is a Catholic priest. Father Curran is a Catholic priest. And whatever else you may say about him, the average Irish American is loyal to the Catholic church. If he is sorry for himself and repeats *Social Justice* nonsense, it is because he has been given his cue by Catholic priests.

Unfortunate as it may be, the Roman Catholic church is going to be held to account for Coughlin, Curran, and company by the American people. Any fine distinction drawn between a priest speaking for the church and a priest speaking as an irresponsible individual will be as beside the point in the final adding up of the score as it is meaningless to many Irish Americans in Boston today. If the official Catholic hierarchy in America doesn't know this, it is time someone told them. For the sooner the responsible Catholic authorities act on this knowledge the better will be the relations between their church and the rest of this nation in the years to come.

Headaches in Post-War Planning

BY MAXWELL S. STEWART

NOT all of Washington's feverish energies these days are going into plans for the prosecution of the war. In almost every department of government a few individuals are concerned with the vast problems that are bound to arise when peace comes. No one seems to pay much attention to the work these men are doing. But assuming we win the war, their decisions may determine the shape of the post-war world.

Responsibility for the general aspect of long-range post-war planning is in the hands of the National Resources Planning Board. But several of the regular government departments have advisers on post-war problems, and there is at least one unofficial group, made up of men from a number of agencies, which serves as a sort of intellectual clearing-house for the subject. In addition, the National Resources Planning Board has deliberately drawn industrialists, bankers, real-estate operators, builders, and other representatives of private business into its discussions, in the hope of forming as broad a base as possible for its work. The Board of Economic Warfare, headed by Vice-President Wallace, is the agency most directly concerned with post-war planning in the international field, but the State Department, the Commerce Department, and the Tariff Commission also want a share in the program-building.

It is only to be expected that the various individuals and agencies interested in the problem should have differing ideas about the post-war program. A basis of agreement is found in the feeling that something must be done to prevent a post-war economic breakdown and a repetition of the present conflict, but there is little else in the way of common ground. The differences are not primarily over minor matters such as methods of approach; they concern the basic nature of the post-war world.

We find, on the one hand, an articulate and influential group of New Dealers who would meet the post-war crisis with a broad and fairly rigid system of economic planning. Illustrative of the thinking of this group are two booklets recently prepared by Alvin H. Hansen of Harvard, a special economic adviser of the Federal Reserve System. Professor Hansen holds that a post-war depression can be avoided by a carefully planned program of combined consumer and government spending. The increase in consumer spending would be brought about by a reversal of the policies necessitated by the war. Taxes, particularly excise taxes, would be lightened, consumer credit would be expanded, and individuals would be encouraged to spend the money they are now saving for the purchase of defense bonds and even to dip into their war-time savings. The government spending would fall into two main categories: (1) expansion of the federal social-welfare program to include provision for family allowances, greater efforts in the field of nutrition, an enlarged public-health program, and a revised old-age-assistance scheme; and (2) aid in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

financing a gigantic urban redevelopment and housing program. Professor Hansen rejects as quite without foundation the notion that such a program would be difficult to finance. "Every cent expended, private and public," he points out, "becomes income for members of our own society. Costs and income are just opposite sides of the same shield."

Planning is also being urged as a solution for international anarchy. An important group that includes Vice-President Wallace feels that the control mechanisms developed during the war should be extended and adapted to meet the requirements of the post-war situation. Mr. Wallace would apply, for example, the "ever-normal-granary" principle to a large number of commodities and on a worldwide scale. This would mean the development of a permanent system of export quotas and an attempt to stabilize prices at a point fair to both consumers and producers. It would presumably be accompanied by a system of international credits not dissimilar to our present lend-lease arrangements.

As might be expected, these ideas of planning have met violent opposition both within and outside government circles. Washington is full of men who are convinced that Hansen's schemes are hopelessly impracticable. Some persons, particularly those linked with real-estate or building interests, regard them as dangerously socialistic. But criticism is not confined to the conservative camp. Many liberal New Dealers are frankly disturbed by the possibility of further extension of economic controls. In most cases their anxiety is based on practical experience rather than a nostalgic distaste for regimentation. They have seen an idealistic yet practical experiment in planning like the AAA become the football of pressure politics. And they have seen idealistic planners develop a vested interest in their own plans which has transformed them into the most dangerous type of bureaucrat.

Critics of Wallace's program for post-war reconstruction charge that it is a gigantic AAA, on an international scale. They challenge the assumption that the post-war world must be built on the patterns created during the war. All the existing instruments of control in the international field, they argue, are weapons of economic warfare, and as such are ill adapted to the requirements of a cooperative international society. And they maintain that controls of any type in the hands of the average government official would inevitably be used for nationalistic purposes.

The sharp line of cleavage between these two camps promises to cause many headaches before it is bridged. It is of course not surprising that many members of the staff of the Board of Economic Warfare support Wallace's views on the post-war world, while the economic staff of the State Department tends to oppose controls as inconsistent with Secretary Hull's reciprocal-trade policy. The State Department has never admitted that the Board of Economic Warfare is responsible for the shaping of post-war economic policies. It insists, on apparently sound grounds, that these policies should not be determined by any domestic agency but must grow out of negotiations with foreign countries. The recent lend-lease agreement with Great Britain and the one in prospect with China would seem to show that such negotiations fall within the province of the State Department. There is reason to believe that the area of responsibility of these two agencies will soon be more clearly delimited.

The larger issues of post-war reconstruction are not likely to be thus arbitrarily settled. But they are not incapable of settlement. The differences of opinion arise largely from a tendency to oversimplify the complex problems of present-day social and economic organization. Actually there can be no simple pattern for post-war reconstruction, and the effort to achieve one is responsible for much fruitless controversy. If the opponents of post-war planning could be brought around the same table with the planners, the two groups would be found much closer to agreement than is generally believed. Probably no one in a responsible position wishes to go back to the dog-eat-dog days of unfettered competition. On the other hand, few would deny that the laws of supply and demand perform a useful function within a restricted area. To be more specific, even the most hard-boiled real-estate operator will concede that some government aid is necessary if the public is to have adequate housing, and the most utopian planner sees the difficulties of large-scale government construction and operation. If the problem is to be solved, it will not be by seeking a generalized formula, applicable to the whole area of post-war reconstruction, but by deciding each situation on its merits.

Experience has shown, for example, that there is little opposition to the use of federal funds to support private building projects, and the United States Housing Authority has worked out a complicated but effective method of cooperation between federal and local authorities. The results, however, have not proved entirely satisfactory. The houses built for the low-income groups have, in general, been considerably better than those occupied by the majority of middle-income families, who could not qualify for the projects. And little or nothing has been done to meet the housing needs of the latter group. This has created a good deal of jealousy and friction throughout the country. In Detroit, where racial as well as economic differences were involved, rioting developed as a result of supposed favoritism. Problems of this type will obviously have to be cleared up if we are to count on a post-war building program to save us from a depression. If housing standards must be somewhat lowered in order to get the houses built in quantity and if the cooperation of real-estate interests must be obtained in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

order to get housing for the middle-income groups, these compromises must be worked out while there is yet time.

It may be argued that ultimately we shall have to choose between a completely planned society and a return to laissez faire. Possibly. But even the Soviet Union found it unwise to attempt too rapid an expansion of the area of its planned economy. As long as we retain private enterprise as the foundation stone of our economic structure, our planning cannot be complete. If private enterprise is to function efficiently, provision must be made not only for incentives in the form of profits but for a certain market-place flexibility in price, supply, and demand. In general, planning which concerns itself with broad fiscal policies and allocation of federal funds preserves this flexibility and does not interfere with private enterprise, while attempts to impose priorities or other quantitative controls, or to compete directly with private enterprise, lead to serious difficulties.

When we approach the problems of international reconstruction, the necessity for compromise between laissez faire and planning becomes more apparent. The failure of the efforts made during the first post-war period to reduce tariffs, restore the gold standard, and encourage private international lending indicates the futility of that type of approach. It is generally admitted today that the self-adjusting international economy which existed before World War I was an imperialist economy, based on the exploitation of backward countries. We cannot restore that system if we would. On the other hand, a system of controls such as were imposed during the period of frenzied economic warfare in the 1930's may be even more detrimental. Restrictions of any type tend to lower living standards, and, if competitive, to lay the basis for war.

Yet the removal of these artificial barriers to trade, although desirable, is bound to create new problems. Many of the countries devastated by the war are going to need help. Specialized raw materials, machinery, and equipment from the United States will be needed to develop the latent industrial resources of China, India, and the Latin American countries. In this situation we may very well find that we cannot produce enough to meet all needs. Years may be required before our industry can be restored to a full peace-time program. If no attempt is made to plan post-war reconstruction, these supplies will go to the highest bidder, regardless of need. In practice this would probably mean that China, India, and

SPRING ASSIGNMENT

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the poorer of the Latin American states would be unable to obtain the needed materials. A system of export controls would make possible a more equitable distribution of these supplies, but we have seen that such restrictions are open to grave abuses. Perhaps the most serious objection to this type of control is that it places too much power and responsibility in the hands of a single agency. The controlling body would have vast power over industry, trade, and commerce, not only at home but also abroad. It should be obvious that no group of men in Washington can have sufficient knowledge to decide in detail what every country in the world should import from the United States.

This difficulty could be avoided if, instead of seeking to control each item of export, the United States contented itself with broad financial help to the countries in need of post-war assistance and then permitted these countries to purchase what they want at market prices. This principle has been followed to a considerable extent in the lend-lease assistance given to Britain and China. It has the advantages of encouraging flexibility in price, supply, and demand. Theoretically, it may be inferior to a system of world planning in which the interests of the backward countries are given first consideration. But it is a type of planning which is feasible in a transition period, and it is infinitely safer than an attempt to impose a pattern of American or Anglo-American economic domination on an unwilling world.

Changes in Finland

BY MAURICE FELDMAN

IN RECENT months the political life of Finland has undergone drastic changes which have hardly been noticed abroad. Today Finland is governed by a military dictatorship entirely under German control. President Risto Ryti in his speeches has violently assailed the British plutocracy and the "slave treaty" of Versailles. One of the best known of Finnish historians, Jalmari Jaakkola, in a book entitled "Finland's Eastern Problem," has raised the cry of *Lebensraum* for Finland and claimed even districts around Leningrad as Finnish. Professor Jaakkola's book has been made a compulsory textbook in all high schools and has been translated into Swedish, German, French, and English. The Finnish National Socialist newspaper *Kansallissosialisti* declared that it is for Finns what "Mein Kampf" is "for our brothers in arms . . . the confession of our faith," adding, "With the help of the German people and their great Führer, Adolf Hitler, our leader, Mannerheim, will obtain for Finland the place it deserves under the sun." Ryti's tirades against Great Britain and Jaakkola's book were also enthusiastically welcomed by the *Ajan Suunta,* organ of the Patriotic People's Movement, the Finnish fascist party.

This party has eight seats in the Finnish Diet and is often supported by representatives of the National Coalition Party, with twenty-five seats, and of some other parties which have suddenly developed National Socialist leanings. The majority of the Diet, however, is made up of representatives of the Social Democratic Party, with eighty-five seats, and of the Swedish Party, with twenty-five seats. These two parties and in general the Agrarian League, with fifty-six seats, still stand for democracy and strongly oppose the imperialists, militarists, and Quislings. The organ of the Finnish Social Democrats, the *Suomen Sosialidemokraatti,* has sharply disputed the claims of Mannerheim, Ryti, and Jaakkolla for a Finnish *Lebensraum.* On January 3, 1942, it said in its leading article, "In Finland the problem of *Lebensraum* has never existed. The *Lebensraum* of the workers is freedom. The workers, who have shown that they know their duties, know also their rights."

The same newspaper declared on the following day: "The Finnish people are longing for peace, and the first thing to do is to stop military operations. Finland's policy has never been and must never be a policy of imperialist aggression." The trade unions are also demanding peace. Their leaders recently called on Premier J. W. Rangell and told him they could not guarantee order and discipline in plants and among the unemployed unless the government made peace immediately and removed all Gestapo officials from Finnish bureaus. The union leaders referred to the great scarcity of supplies and the rise in prices and pointed out that while Finland was short of almost every kind of food, German soldiers were sending home food parcels weighing ten pounds. They also protested against the intention of the Finnish government and the German authorities to send all Finnish unemployed to Germany.

That conditions in Finland are going from bad to worse was confirmed by the editors of reputable conservative and liberal newspapers in Sweden—such as the *Göteborgs Posten,* the *Dagens Nyheter,* and the *Sydsvenska Dagbladet*—who recently returned from a trip through Finland. Finland's export trade, which before the war consisted mainly of lumber and pulp for Great Britain and the United States, is today entirely cut off.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Its agriculture, which is chiefly stock-raising, has suffered tremendously because no fodder can be imported from overseas and the farmers, in consequence, are forced to slaughter their cattle. Discontent is growing among the farmers and workers.

Under Nazi pressure hundreds of liberal politicians, journalists, and professional men have been arrested as Communists, though in fact their views were anything but radical. The fate of such left-wing Social Democrats as K. H. Viik, the former secretary of the party, and the deputies Ryömä and Sundström is unknown. In Helsinki and other cities short-wave radio sets have been confiscated to prevent the people from listening to Finnish broadcasts from London. According to a report from Stockholm, control of Finnish policy has been shifted from the Diet to the General Staff of the army. Baron Mannerheim is said to have declared in a Cabinet meeting shortly before Christmas, "If the Diet does not want to obey, we will chase it out of Finland. There was nothing but talk until we started marching shoulder to shoulder with Germany. The time for action has now arrived."

Baron Mannerheim

Mannerheim and his officers, 85 per cent of whom belonged to the Nazi Lappo movement, are today the masters of Finland. The Finnish army, however, enjoys only as much freedom of movement and can exercise only as much influence on domestic politics as the German Nazis will permit. Sweden, because of its close ties with its neighbor—Finland belonged to Sweden from 1155 to 1809—feels great sympathy with the Finnish people and has repeatedly tried to persuade the government and Mannerheim to make peace. But all its endeavors to act as an intermediary have failed. Relations between the Finnish Quislings and the democratic Swedes have now deteriorated. Swedish newspapers are prohibited in Finland, and the Swedish government is often sharply attacked in the press. The movement to send Finnish children to Sweden was discontinued on account of German interference. The *Uusi Suomi,* organ of the National Coalition Party, has contended that food should be sent to Finland but that Finnish children should not be sent to Sweden. The widening breach between the Finns and the Swedes is fostered by the Nazis. Recent actions against the 1,700 Finnish Jews were of course inspired from Berlin.

Everybody's Business

BY KEITH HUTCHISON

Wall Street's Tax Program

EGGED on by a large part of the press, the business lobbies are advancing on Capitol Hill with the objective of turning Mr. Morgenthau's tax program inside out. Their program is "Lower taxes for the rich; higher taxes for the poor," though naturally they don't put it quite so bluntly.

Publicly their arguments run somewhat along these lines: We agree with Mr. Morgenthau that a war tax program must seek to cut down the amount of income available for consumption. Otherwise the excess of purchasing power over the volume of goods and services in the market will inevitably exert an irresistible upward pressure on prices. But if we are to achieve this we must locate the additional purchasing power created by the war program and tax that. It is not to be found among the upper and middle income brackets, where taxation is already so heavy that living standards are being revised downward, nor is it visible in corporation profits—after taxes. Hence it must be found going into the hands of the workers, including those at present totally exempt from direct taxation.

This argument leads to the proposition that the way to raise the necessary revenue and to check inflation is to tax the real war profiteers—the workers. But while the business lobbies agree about the desirability of this objective, they have not reached complete accord in regard to means. One school would like to reduce or even abolish personal exemptions altogether, but the objection to this course is that it would increase the taxes payable all the way up. A more popular proposal is for a general sales tax; this has been strongly urged on the House Ways and Means Committee by the New York State Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers.

W. J. Schieffelin, Jr., spokesman for the first of these organizations, stated that the Treasury was trying to raise too much new revenue as well as seeking it in the wrong spot. The House, he suggested, should levy an additional total of $5,000,000,000 instead of aiming at Mr. Morgenthau's figure of $7,160,000,000, and should rely mainly on a sales tax instead of mainly on income and excess-profits taxes. He proposed a 5 per cent sales tax on all products except food, which would be taxed only 2 per cent, and a few luxury articles to be charged at higher rates, and estimated that these rates would produce a total of $4,000,000,000.

The National Association of Manufacturers placed before the House two alternative sales-tax schedules: (1) a 4 per cent manufacturers' tax, imposed at the point of final sale, together with a 4 per cent war tax on general consumption at the point of final sale; or (2) an 8 per cent war tax on general consumption at the point of final sale. The first combination, it was stated, would yield $4,400,000,000 and the second $4,800,000,000.

Examination of these proposals at least excuses the New York Chamber of Commerce and the N. A. M. of any close conspiracy, for if the estimates of one are correct, those of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the other must be cockeyed. Since the N. A. M. expects an 8 per cent tax to yield $4,800,000,000, it is obviously anticipating total sales of $60,000,000,000. It is not possible to calculate just what retail turnover the Chamber estimates would be necessary for its selective-rate scheme to produce $4,000,000,000; but assuming an average of 5 per cent, gross sales greatly in excess of $60,000,000,000 would be necessary.

In regard to direct taxation, the Chamber and the N. A. M. agreed that Mr. Morgenthau is much too tough. The Chamber proposed that increases in income and corporation taxes should be limited to $1,000,000,000, or less than one-sixth of the amount which would be procured by the Treasury's proposals. The N. A. M. program was heralded as one of "taxation to the limit—leaving only enough for survival"; and actually it suggested a 9 per cent excess-profits tax, compared with the Treasury recommendation for graduated rates ranging from 50 to 75 per cent. This noble gesture lost its effect when it was followed by requests for a number of changes in the method of computing excess profits and for considerably lower rates on corporation surtaxes. The net result of these proposals would be an increase in corporation taxes of about $1,400,000,000, or half the amount sought by the Treasury. And some large corporations, as the N. A. M. representatives admitted, would pay less than they do now.

The case against the general sales tax has frequently been stated in these pages, and there is no need to elaborate it again. Falling as it does with equal force on the poor man's loaf and the rich man's caviar, it is the most inequitable form of taxation. Yet a sales tax on everything except absolute necessities might be justified in war time. For the arguments of its proponents are sound to this extent: it is not possible to curb the excess purchasing power set free by war expenditure solely by taxing the rich and the well-to-do. If all incomes over, say, $5,000 were taken by the Treasury, there would still be an inflationary lack of balance between available income and available goods. And inflation, let us remember, is the most unjust form of taxation.

It follows, therefore, that either additional taxation on the low brackets or some form of compulsory savings or both is a necessity in the present situation, and Mr. Morgenthau can be criticized for pitching his total demands too low. But what cannot possibly be justified are proposals for adding to the burden at the bottom of the income scale in order to lighten the load at the top.

The financial press frequently makes the point that the limit of taxation on corporations has been reached and that if further "exactions" are imposed they will regretfully be unable to fulfil their production tasks. Patriotism, in other words, is not enough unless stimulated by sufficient profits. A correspondent airing this view in the *Wall Street Journal* of March 12 wrote, "Even in Nazi Germany corporations are allowed to earn 6 or 7 per cent of invested capital, but, then, Herr Hitler's financial advisers are too astute not to realize that there is nothing to be gained and much to be lost by killing the goose that lays the golden eggs."

My own confidential agent in Germany tells me that a secret conclave of corporation chiefs met in Berlin to study the March bulletin of the National City Bank of New York. They were amazed to find a table showing that the net income after taxes of 825 leading American manufacturing corporations was 23.7 per cent higher in 1941 than in 1940, and that the return on net worth rose from 9.9 per cent to 11.9 per cent. One daring soul said, "We should protest to the Führer about our miserable 7 per cent when even Roosevelt refuses to kill the goose that lays the golden eggs and permits nearly 12 per cent." But the others hushed him: "Better not; after all, Roosevelt doesn't put business men in concentration camps either."

In the Wind

TECHNOCRACY, INC., long thought to be a dead or dormant movement, has come back to life with an expensive newspaper advertising campaign. Howard Scott, who started Technocracy in 1933, is leading its revival. Not only does he boast of a scheme to increase production many times, but he claims that his engineers have designed a bombing plane that will fly around the globe with a twenty-five-ton bomb load. Observers who have attended recent Technocracy meetings report that the members have taken to military uniforms and drill. A feature of the new program is its recommendation that all public bars be closed and that distribution of liquor be curtailed.

THE KU KLUX KLAN, which was involved in the race riots at the Sojourner Truth housing project in Detroit, is organizing small units called the "Faithful Fifties" throughout the country.

BRITISH LIBERALS are protesting against the government's withdrawal of its subsidy from *Picture Post,* a publication resembling the American *Life.* The Ministry of Information had been buying bulk lots of the magazine for distribution to troops and civilians in the Middle East, but when *Picture Post* published an article by Tom Wintringham criticizing the conduct of the Libyan campaign, the ministry refused to purchase any more copies.

LEADERS OF PUBLIC OPINION on the West Coast are demanding that a representative of that region be given a high position in the war effort. At present no member of the Cabinet or the production boards is from the Far West.

A BRONX CHAPTER of the America First Committee held an officers' meeting on March 6, 1942. . . . Joe McWilliams's American Destiny Party held a meeting on March 4 at which it was announced that McWilliams would soon be returning from Chicago to New York to continue his political work.

THREE TRUCKLOADS of the best brandies and wines from the Normandie—which boasted one of the finest stocks in the world—were removed for the personal use of Gaston Henry-Haye, Vichy's ambassador in Washington.

[*We invite our readers to submit material for In the Wind —either clippings with source and date or stories that can be clearly authenticated. A prize of $5 will be awarded each month for the best item.*—EDITORS THE NATION.]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS *and the* ARTS

Memo for Mr. Jarrell

RANDALL JARRELL'S remarks on modernism and romanticism in contemporary poetry are interesting: he has correctly noted that all modern poetry is really romantic, and he has intelligently catalogued various manifestations of the romantic impulse. A certain inadequacy in his discussion, however, arises from the fact that he has not gone back far enough; he does not exactly fall short but rather plunges, as it were, *in medias res,* or *in prope extremas res.* His assumption, implicit and apologetic, is that his subject, the classical versus the romantic, is almost too trite to treat, and that because of its familiarity there is no need for definition of terms: everybody knows the difference. Everybody knows that the Epicureans put rich food in, the Stoics hungry foxes on, their respective bellies; everybody knows that the difference between classic and romantic is—but come to think of it, what is the difference?

By way of contributing to the discussion, and for what it is worth, I offer here the suggestion that the basic difference between the classical and the romantic artist lies in his attitude toward the society, the state, in which he lives. You cannot hate that state and be a classical artist; you can like it, and be a romantic one. It is not so much a question of approval as of participation. The classical artist thinks of himself as primarily a citizen, the romantic as individual. Both accept the obligations imposed on them by their art; both, if that art takes the form of writing, write as they must: but the romantic writer is thinking, "I write as I please," the classical, "I write as I should." The classical writer, therefore, exercises propriety, restraint, decorum, not as virtues *per se;* his aesthetics are imposed by his civics. It is not true that only the classical writer is concerned with form; the romantic writers are often preoccupied with it to the point of obsession, witness the Alexandrians, but they come to it by what they believe is free choice, not civic responsibility.

It would seem to follow from this that a classical writer can only appear within a closed political system sufficiently unstable to require the close attachment of its members, who nevertheless regard it as static. So in the past we have had primitive societies, isolated city states, or a world society organized along Catholic (religious) or feudal (political) lines, in which romantic writers, if they appeared, would be classed as heretics. It would likewise follow that a classical writer must be pretty rare, well-nigh impossible, in English literature, for the entire history of English literacy is involved in the rise of the bourgeoisie, and Protestantism in religion and laissez faire in economics turn the writer into either a successful merchandiser of commodities or an outraged outcast. Milton, I suppose, had a certain amount of civic sense; in the eighteenth century a good many writers thought themselves citizens of an autonomous republic of letters inside England; and, close to our own time, one might think of Kipling as possessed of certain classical tendencies.

Among the Greeks there was a high proportion of classical poets; among the Romans, almost none. For one thing, the Romans' belief in their cultural inferiority to the Greeks inhibited a strong civic feeling in their own literature; the only form they claimed as their own, satire, as they defined it, abounds in romantic extravagances. For another thing, the change of the Roman state from an agrarian republic to a mercantile imperialism was too swift and successful to require their attachment; under this prosperity it was easier to become sophisticated than patriotic. Augustus, troubled by the lack of morale, tried to restore the atmosphere of the good old days; but Varro had been no match for Lucretius, and even in the writers who tried their best to be sympathetic with their patron, Vergil and Horace, the individual kept triumphing over the citizen. Propertius, who was also in the Augustan circle, was downright wanton, and Ovid, outside it, eventually paid with exile for the privilege of treating as he pleased the society he so richly enjoyed. The more one studies our own poetry in the light of that of Alexandria and Rome, the more one will see how greatly similar causes combine to produce similar effects.

Mr. Jarrell might have pointed out, with more assurance than he did, the fact that modern neo- or pseudo- or would-be-classical aspirations are themselves an inevitable vagary of romanticism, and fundamentally romantic. We may interpret the yearnings of the humanists, the Southern agrarians, Yvor Winters, or T. S. Eliot as we wish; say that they indicate (psychologically) the desire to return to the authority of the father, or that they have revolutionary significance (politically) because they are opposed to the present system. Either way they fail to be classical because they mistake the outward and visible form for the inward and spiritual grace; what they are working out, rather cleverly, is a new device for insuring originality. But a protest against Protestantism is still Protestant; the desire to escape romanticism itself romantic.

If we live long enough, we may see the establishment of a society—a mechanized worldwide industrial communism—out of which a classical literature might be expected to emerge. We are not likely, however, to see such a literature, for it will be a long time after that before all residues of romanticism are absorbed or liquidated, before all the throwbacks are weeded out. In our own day the Gothic tale comes sneaking in disguised as a detective story; and we have poets whose spiritual relation to the nineteenth, eighteenth, seventeenth, or sixteenth century is much closer than their use of references to Darwin, Freud, or Marx inclines us to suspect. And the critic of the future will also have some nice problems in deciding where the line is drawn between the man who really and truly writes as citizen and the one who merely attempts to merit the sanction of officialdom and the approval of the dominant oligarchical bureaucrats.

ROLFE HUMPHRIES

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Sparrow Revolution

THE PINK EGG. By Polly Boyden. Truro, Massachusetts: The Pamet Press. $2.

THIS is a fable about the downtrodden, underprivileged sparrows who make a revolution and throw all the robins and other handsomer, luckier, and more talented birds out of the orchard where they live, and some of the very nicest robins turn in and help them. As one of the singing birds says, wistfully: "But all you sparrows are so much closer to the future than we other birds; so you must show us how to get there because we do not want to lose our way."

Why choose sparrows out of all the bird world to represent the human downtrodden and underprivileged? They are fairly dull-looking little birds who do not sing; they are the most gluttonous of small birds except the bluejay, so lecherous they have become the symbol of human incontinence, and so quarrelsome there is no getting on with them at all. Any bird can tell you. If you want to get down on sparrows just watch them descend on a feeding station where robins and wrens and mocking birds and all sorts of sweet singing creatures are sharing their food in peace. Will the sparrows allow this to go on? No, they scatter the others with blows and curses and then fight among themselves as they lick the platter clean. Only the bluejay can beat them at this game, and only because he is bigger and has a tougher beak. Ounce for ounce, the sparrow is meaner than a bluejay. He simply hasn't got the heft.

If the future of the bird world is really with the sparrows, it is a grim prospect. It is significant, too, that the sparrows were able to enlist almost the whole bird race in an unselfish labor to further the good of—you've guessed it, the sparrows. They say the campaign will be for the improvement of all, but nothing in their conduct leads you to believe this. They lack almost everything it takes to create a good world, they are as noisy and selfish and dull as some people, really; but what is good for sparrows, they say, will be plenty good enough for other birds: they'll take it and like it, or they'll have to go, that's all. They will be spared to work, however, until they have finished helping the sparrows build a world in which nothing a sparrow cannot appreciate will be permitted to exist.

St. Francis doped the birds, preaching to them that way, says one debunking sparrow. But if birds are what this book makes them out to be, it is possible that the birds doped poor St. Francis. At any rate, if they were sparrows, he wasted his breath talking to them. They'll never learn by that method.

The symbol of the lighthouse in this story interests me because it illustrates the danger of turning the world over to the sparrows. This lighthouse stands on an island, the only spot hospitable to sparrows; in the jacket note it is identified as danger and desire. Left to myself I might have thought it stood for Truth or the Light of Reason or Morality. Whatever it may mean, there is something sinister in the attitude of the sparrows toward this lighthouse. It is the creation of human beings, who collectively seem to mean, to the birds, a higher power which distributes its favors on a mysterious plan: the island is free to any bird who can reach it, and it is meant to be a place of shelter and peace. What is the meaning of the lighthouse? the birds ask among themselves. A sparrow remarks that they don't know yet what it means, but they will look into the question later, and there is a hint that once the birds find their way to the island, they will put out the light, since they will not need it any more.

Now if the lighthouse really signifies danger and desire, those birds are very silly to think they can abolish it. And if it should mean guidance, for example, and was put there for the convenience and safety of birds, their plan to put it out when they no longer need it seems to me shortsighted and selfish to the last degree. There will always be birds in the infinite future trying to find their way to the island.

Well, these birds build fires and wear orange felt hats and wield apple axes and carry away their wounded on stretchers, and if the author is not really talking about birds, I am. I say it is a grim little slander on the birds, and on that part of the human race typified by the sparrows. I don't think the working people, the proletariat as they used to be called, are at all like sparrows, and I think the choice of such a comparison is not very tactful to say the least.

It is odd, also, to find another fallacy: the intelligent, poetic, inspired, and heroic birds in the feathered revolutionary movement are nearly all renegades from the upper classes who sacrifice their fortunes and devote their talents to their less fortunate brethren. I don't agree with this thesis. Those birds from the upper classes haven't been half as important as they like to believe. I think most of them have had a good time and got more than they gave. The really heavy job has been done by the working people.

As for these birds with their unpleasantly human ways, I am reminded irresistibly of the beachcomber's fable about the man who tried to make the mice in his house wear little wool hats during the cold weather. He wasn't any more successful than Miss Boyden trying to make her birds wear waistcoats, but he was a great deal funnier.

KATHERINE ANNE PORTER

Nazi-Ridden Rumania

ATHENE PALACE. By R. G. Waldeck. Robert M. McBride and Company. $2.75.

UNTIL "neutral" Rumania entered the war, Bucharest was the witches' caldron of the Balkans. Diplomats and agents were scheming and intriguing; there was espionage and counter-espionage on a large scale. The Athene Palace Hotel was the luxurious center of this activity. It was also the point of vantage from which Countess Waldeck, an American journalist of European descent, and accent, watched the Nazi spider spin the web in which anti-Nazi Rumania ultimately was caught.

In the frame of a personal narrative the Countess offers character sketches of the leading actors in the Rumanian drama. Interwoven with accounts of tragic events are delightful stories which bear witness to her keen power of observation. She shows how the pro-Ally Antonescu became a German tool and how even the Nazis could not always bridge the gap between planning and reality. Her portraits of the "Old Excellencies"—those aristocrats who found

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Maniu, the incorruptible leader of the Peasant Party and the hope of a liberal and democratic Rumania, so "irritating" —and her cartoon of the *hohe Tier,* the "big shot," of the German military mission are drawn in the best Hogarthian manner. As for the royal dictator who ruled the country with the assistance of Urdareanu and Madame Lupescu from 1938 until his flight, she makes it clear that "Carol was neither pro- nor anti-German, nor pro- nor anti-British. He was only pro-Carol."

In spite of its gossipy background, this account of Nazi propaganda carried on with two sets of agents, one official, the other unofficial and more efficient, is a valuable contribution to current history. About one of the unofficial agents, an Austrian Catholic count but a "150 per cent Nazi," with whom the author established "a beautiful friendship built on a mutual distrust, scientific curiosity, and a sort of wistful fondness," we learn that he was thoroughly informed concerning American affairs. He could, for instance, "discuss by the hour the relative merits of Mr. Bliven of the *New Republic* and Miss Kirchwey of *The Nation.*" He thought, incidentally, that American totalitarianism would be along Communist lines because there was no American race.

Nazi propaganda, judged by its results, was, indeed, clever, but the Nazis, for all their haughtiness, harbor a subconscious inferiority complex. This becomes conspicuous in the jokes which the Nazis, like the Jews, tell of themselves. Mme Waldeck quotes them as saying that "they could not tolerate real Jews when they were able to produce an ever-so-much better synthetic Jew, as the person of Herr Dr. Goebbels proved."

Intermixed with comments of a personal character, "Athene Palace" includes various political remarks very much to the point. We may doubt whether it was, indeed, Stalin's occupation of Bessarabia that brought the German attack on Russia, but it is certain that the Vienna award on Transylvania was not only "a blatantly uncreative, unimaginative, sterile decision" but a great blunder when one considers how badly Hitler needed peace in his southeastern *Grossraum.* Countess Waldeck watched with keen insight the clash of Nazi and Rumanian fascism, a clash which explains why the Germans preferred to collaborate with the doubtfully fascist Gigurtu than with the Iron Guard. And we must heartily indorse her judgment that "universal mercy was the imperialistic element in any order," and that therefore, Hitler's order, "which condemns a priori entire races and nations to everlasting doom," has no hope of success in spite of its military victories.

Occasionally there are overstatements, as for example, that for the last twenty years "Hungarian fathers of families always said, 'No, no, never,' as they sat down to eat their goulash." Hungarian government propaganda must not be mistaken for the habits of Hungarian farm hands whose wages average twenty cents a day. Rumanian peasants are no better off. Anyone who wishes to learn something of their fate would do better to read Donald Hall's "Rumanian Furrow," but no person who is interested in the machinations of grafty Rumanian politicians, beguiling feminine entanglements, Balkan glamor, and underground Nazi plotting should miss this witty and fascinating book. One page on the assassinated Professor Jorga, "the Rumanian version of the Goethean man," is more valuable than many volumes on Rumania written by errant journalists—errant in both senses of the word.

RUSTEM VAMBERY

A New Poet

AWAKE! AND OTHER WAR TIME POEMS. By W. R. Rodgers. Harcourt, Brace and Company. $1.50.

W. R. RODGERS is undoubtedly a writer of real distinction. The appearance of a poet who has a command of words, an individual technique, and a capacity to say what he means, as distinct from the many writers who have some good taste and happy moments and are intoxicated with uncontrolled words and ideas, is a literary event. The critics should therefore salute Mr. Rodgers, and those who enjoy poetry should read him.

W. R. Rodgers has the intellectual power to organize a strong imagination. That is saying a great deal, and, beyond it, there is little that it can be useful to say at present. I think it is mischievous to say, as one critic has done: "I back him to go as far as, or farther than, Auden." Critics are not tipsters, and there is nothing whatever in Rodgers's poetry to invite comparison with Auden, unless one regards all contemporary literature as a great race in which one poet wins, thus doing credit to the critic who has backed him. Rodgers lacks Auden's intellectual curiosity, lightness of touch, mastery of varied patterns, everything that is Auden's; just as Auden lacks Rodgers's vivid kinetic imagery and the attractive clumsiness which makes reading some of his poems resemble walking across a plowed field on a windy day, with occasional glimpses of a bright transparent sky through the clouds.

The poet with whom it may be helpful to compare Rodgers is Frederic Prokosch. Prokosch is musical and smooth, whereas Rodgers is harsh, violent, and unmusical, but nevertheless their talents, as poetic types, are similar in being immediately attractive, with an almost physical attraction. Neither goes very far beyond the attractiveness of his poetic appearance, as yet. Prokosch is hyacinthine, Narcissus-like, Grecian; Rodgers is husky and hairy, a man from the Irish bogs—I speak of their poetic, not their physical, exteriors. The reader is fascinated by both of these appearances; but when it comes to asking the poet what he thinks, they are both curiously monosyllabic. If they do express anything resembling an idea, its conventionality contrasts rather strangely with their lush style.

Thus Mr. Rodgers is most successful in taking ordinary attitudes to life and projecting them in brilliant pictures. The most brilliantly successful of these attempts is "Summer Holidays," an account of the clerk's excursion on holiday into natural scenery. The view of the clerk, that his life consists of Rut and Rout, is one that has been insisted on by many poets, since about the year 1900. Within the limits of this modern poetic convention "Summer Holidays" is a striking word-picture sustained for several pages and only collapsing in the commonplaces about history at the end.

The imagery of Rodgers's poetry often strikes one with a shock of surprise and delight, like some French impressionist painting:

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Suddenly all the fountains in the park
Opened smoothly their umbrellas of water

This is lovely, surely, and there are many moments as lovely in this short book.

Rodgers's faults are an unrestrained verbosity and a sometimes tiresome over-use of alliteration. With more economy he would be a wholly delightful, if somewhat spasmodic, poet. With more thought the development of his poems would be strong and sweeping. As it is, his lines tend to arrest the attention, and then fail to develop beyond what is vivid and striking. Sometimes the ends of poems seem arbitrary and prosaic.

This volume contains all that Mr. Rodgers has as yet written; naturally, therefore, there are occasional failures. But the general impression it leaves is that he is already a poet with a brilliant power of observation and an ability to organize, as in "Summer Holidays," many images and pictures into a coherent whole. There are genuine and memorable experiences in this book. STEPHEN SPENDER

Britain and America

THE ATLANTIC SYSTEM: THE STORY OF ANGLO-AMERICAN CONTROL OF THE SEAS. By Forrest Davis. Reynal and Hitchcock. $3.

FORREST DAVIS has done much more than present unassailable proof of the inevitability of Anglo-American cooperation in the Atlantic. While this hitherto unrecognized natural partnership is the main thesis of "The Atlantic System," the by-products of the work are just as valuable. Presenting the popular as well as the official and semi-official arguments on both sides of the question, Mr. Davis not only proves his point but shows with unexaggerated emphasis the great danger to a country of the forces of ignorance and partisanship. But for these unfortunate factors there would have been an end long ago to Anglo-American problems and hesitations, and the indispensability of an all-out alliance between the English-speaking peoples, denying to militaristic powers access to the shores of the Atlantic, would have been manifest.

Americans, as Andrew Carnegie complained, were weaned on "bad history books"; they come to the voting booth, typewriter, and platform obsessed with memories of the Revolution of 1776 and with those British applications of American theories of the freedom of the seas which produced, first, the War of 1812 and then the unpleasantnesses during the Civil War. The citizens of the New World whose false pride forbade their recognition of the hundred years' dependence of the Monroe Doctrine upon the Royal Navy were equally unaware of the steps taken by London to counteract that "Concert of Europe" which aimed at intervention against the United States at the time of the Spanish-American War and the Venezuela crisis. Nor were Americans acquainted with the fact that London had refrained from entering into European arrangements, including a German alliance, lest such action prove disturbing to Washington, and that British ambassadors had repeatedly passed on to our Department of State vital "European" secrets. Mr. Davis describes the steady retreat of British interests in deference to the spirit, and not

How Russia surprised the world...

RUSSIA'S ECONOMIC FRONT FOR WAR AND PEACE

by

ARON YUGOW

$3.00

Authoritative appraisal of Russia's vast resources and their development under the three Five-Year Plans by a man long active in the direction of the U. S. S. R.'s food trust. Gives the reader a new appreciation of Russia's amazing productive capacities.

The story behind two famous books . . .

GRASS ON THE SLAG HEAPS

The Story of the Welsh Miners

by

ELI GINZBERG

$2.50

Here are the stark realities faced by the people of South Wales made famous in *The Citadel* and *How Green Was My Valley.* A first-hand account by an American economist of what happened when the mines closed down. Contains a timely lesson for America's depressed areas.

HARPER & BROTHERS—N. Y.

Mobilize the Colonial World to Defeat the Axis

HEAR

PAUL ROBESON
PEARL S. BUCK

MAX YERGAN, *and others on:*

"The East, Africa, West Indies, and the Negro People of America"

MASS MEETING

MANHATTAN CENTER
34th Street, West of 8th Ave.

Wednesday, APRIL 8, 8:30 p. m.

Admission (tax. incl.) $1.10, 83c, 55c.

Tickets available at:

COUNCIL ON AFRICAN AFFAIRS
8 West 40th Street, Room 2215
New York City Tel. CHickering 4-4743

Please send me ..... tickets at $..... each to the April 8th meeting, for which I enclose $.....

Name.....
Address.....
City.....

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

merely the letter, of the Monroe Doctrine—the settlement of the Venezuelan and Alaskan problems, the relinquishment of British claims to Hawaii and the Panama Canal, and the dismantling of fortifications in this hemisphere. Without elaboration the author indicates how London exchanged an effective military Japanese alliance for an entente with Washington of doubtful reliability, and notes its offer of naval parity with the United States.

Throughout this scholarly presentation Mr. Davis uncovers the activities of a Germany responsible for the Venezuela incident, as interested in expanding into the Western Hemisphere as it was resourceful and tireless in its struggle to drive a wedge between the United States and the British Empire. Berlin's intrigues and overt acts in the Pacific are also shown, and there is a reminder of that school of German geopolitics which aims at dominating the world by seizing control of the Eastern Hemisphere. Here again, though the author does not make the allusion, we had Americans remembering von Steuben, forgetting Manila Bay, overlooking the methods whereby the important atolls of the mandated islands went via Germany to Japan.

"The Atlantic System," covering the period from 1890 to date, deals at length with Woodrow Wilson's total lack of strategic insight, a shortcoming that has been overcome in this country only since the downfall of France, and culminates in the Atlantic Declaration of President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill, with its promises to disarm the militarists and police the world. In a "story of Anglo-American control of the seas" there is little room for a discussion of the position of France. Yet knowing, from this work if from no other, the instability of democratic planning and how readily the peoples of America and Britain might relapse into their customary and disastrous apathy, we cannot well agree with Mr. Davis's afterthought that a liberated France does not belong in the Atlantic System. If Britons have failed to appreciate American problems, if the people of the United States have been remiss in their relations with their de facto transatlantic naval ally, the entire English-speaking world has been even more negligent in its treatment of France during the past thirty years; and this treatment explains, though it does not condone, Vichy's collaboration with the geopoliticians. In any democratic Atlantic System the ideological, military, and geographical position of a strong French Republic, one that has military and naval backing instead of promises and arguments, appears to be a sine qua non.

Mr. Davis has produced a political-naval masterpiece that is as valuable as the best of strategic and tactical treatises. Civilians have here a manual by which to test public opinion and to understand vital problems of national defense against a human rather than a technical background. It reveals the tragedy of unsound, wishful, and malicious thinking, which, during the period in question, has done more to harm democracy than a dozen enemy battle fleets could have hoped to accomplish.

ALEXANDER KIRALFY

Florida People

CROSS CREEK. By Marjorie Kinnan Rawlings. Charles Scribner's Sons. $2.50.

THERE is a deceiving simplicity about "Cross Creek," a book of pleasant reminiscences of "a bend in a country road" by the sharply perceptive author of "The Yearling." By the time you finish it you realize that it is more than the story of the people and flora and fauna of a backwoods community: it is a way of life—a way that smacks of Thoreau, without Thoreau's asceticism, for the author, while believing that nature possesses the secret of happiness, loves all sorts of people, and records their peculiarities of temper and dialect with zest and humor.

"I do not understand," she writes, "how anyone can live without some small place of enchantment to turn to." She herself has found her small place among the colored folk, the white folk, the magnolia trees, the hogs, and the waters of the "Yearling" country, and in this narrative of her sojourn there she reveals herself again as an extremely sensitive observer, who sees much that others do not and feels keenly about everything. It is as if color and sound and happiness and sorrow were all heightened for her, and she translates this brightness and sharpness for the reader. It is hard to believe her assertion that writing causes her "great mental anguish," when her style is so natural, so apparently spontaneous, so full of quick humor and quick sympathies. The Florida she pictures is not the Florida of the resort folders; it is hard and crude, but being at least quiet and warless it has a good deal to recommend it just now, and "Cross Creek" places it before you with haunting charm.

LOUIS B. SALOMON

PEACE BY POWER
BY LIONEL GELBER
A FORECAST based on past performances, not hoped-for miracles, of the kind of peace we can hope for in the post-war world. Lionel Gelber, distinguished Canadian authority on international affairs and first-hand observer of men and events, shows that ultimately we must have peace by power. Power in the right hands, rightly used, can alone bring us the peace we seek.
$1.50 OXFORD

AMUSEMENTS

"Buoyant, Giddy & Funny" —Atkinson, Times
JUNIOR MISS
LYCEUM Theatre, 45th St. E. of B'way. CH 4-4256
Evenings, 8:40; Matinees, WED. and SAT., 2:40

CHERYL CRAWFORD presents
George Gershwin's
PORGY AND BESS
"Go see 'Porgy and Bess' if you go to nothing else" —Kronenberger, PM.
PRICES:
Evgs. . . . $2.75 to 55¢
Mats. . . . $2.20 to 55¢
MAJESTIC THEATRE, W. 44 St. Eves. Incl. Sunday. Mats. Wed. & Sat., 2:30

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Authority and Liberty

ON THE AGENDA OF DEMOCRACY. By Charles E. Merriam. Harvard University Press. $1.50.

PROFESSOR MERRIAM is convinced that "not even enlightened despotism" is the answer to any of the problems which a technical age faces. The answer, on the whole, he believes, is a democracy which emphasizes leadership, technical expertness, and planning. He is convinced that "liberty is not secure in proportion as government has no power." His whole treatise is a convincing refutation of laissez faire conceptions of democracy. In one sense such a thesis holds the candlelight of the obvious to the daylight of common experience, for we are obviously being driven by ineluctable historical forces to various forms of collective control, in both the economic and political sphere, which no one had anticipated a few decades ago. The real question is no longer whether we shall plan or not. The question is where the authority for planning will rest and how effectively we can keep the seats of highly centralized authority under democratic control.

In dealing with this problem on its international level Professor Merriam is convinced that we can move forward to "the security of a jural order of the world in which decisions are made upon the basis of justice rather than violence." He is not unmindful of the many complexities of international politics, but he hardly considers the perplexing problem of the relation of a central authority to the democratic essence of an international order. Any scheme of justice requires an organizing center just as much as a proper balance of all the forces and vitalities involved in it. The relation of authority to liberty is a perennial issue in all forms of political organization. The conflict inherent in these two facets of democracy is not fully comprehended in this otherwise excellent treatise. REINHOLD NIEBUHR

In All Directions

NEW DIRECTIONS IN PROSE AND POETRY, 1941. Edited by James Laughlin. New Directions. $3.50.

IF THE publication of "New Directions in Prose and Poetry" affords the reviewer the opportunity of making remarks about new directions in prose and poetry, then I can best begin this piece by observing that there are no new directions in prose or poetry. Here, mobilized under the somewhat unenthusiastic insignia of a man sitting down on a horse sitting down, the "advance guard of more than forty writers"—I take my facts and figures from the editorial blurb—exhibit their orthodoxy through six hundred pages and ten photographs. The total effect is to produce a book that I can only compare to the Fat Lady of the Circus. Here prose becomes adipose tissue and poetry mucous membrane. I feel that there must be something uncertain in the state of Connecticut, and it is either the weather or the editorial policy of James Laughlin. But before reviewing individual contributions I may point out an error of fact to the editor: Roger Roughton committed suicide in Dublin two years ago; he was not killed in the Spanish civil war. Nor should the suicide of Roughton, even at such a time as this, so full of possible deaths, be passed over parenthetically, for he was, as all his short stories (including The Sand Under the Door, reprinted here) and several of his poems attest, a youth of whom one could speak in the same breath as Charles Hamilton Sorley, Clare Parsons, and that pathetic young poet whom Matthew Arnold elevated from an entirely undeserved oblivion, David Grey. If for nothing else in the collection, those who appreciate precision of prose and a lyrical touch like Mozart's little finger should be grateful to James Laughlin for presenting a good example of Roughton's work.

It is the editorial liberality of New Directions that I boggle at; for the principles of selection at work behind the scenes of this publishing establishment remain quite beyond my personal comprehension. When the emotional constipation of Delmore Schwartz precedes the intellectual looseness of Hugh MacDiarmid, and the deliriums of André Breton follow a Survey Anthology of Soviet Russian Poetry, then I can see no good reason why the text of the Declaration of Independence and excerpts from Winchell do not also appear here. Unless the title of this annual has absolutely no significance whatever, we are entitled to anticipate that the contributions to it will share an element of the experimental that New Writing, for instance, makes no pretensions toward: New Writing is new writing but New Directions is no longer new directions.

The best thing in this issue runs to one and three-quarter pages and in this space does more to divest the human being in front of its own eyes than the whole remaining 598 pages. This is a parable called Before the Law, by Franz Kafka, and apart from being so ambiguously mysterious that each reading surrenders a whole series of new interpretations, it has a kick in the tail which I can only liken to O. Henry or rattlesnakes. There is also a bad-tempered and eccentric paper of Ezra Pound's on The Argument of the Novel that leaves me with the remembrance of a violent old man splashing noisily in the shallows of critical literature when he should be extending more Homage to Sextus Propertius; for Ezra Pound as poet has golden saliva but Ezra Pound as critic is so exhibitionist that I can never see the avoirdupois for the pound. The long surrealist poem Fata Morgana, by André Breton, if cut into strips and colored with crayon, would make a rather delightful dado for a boudoir: unlike Ezra Pound, André Breton is a great critical and theoretical writer who demonstrates perfectly the validity of the proposition that you can't write poems merely because you want to.

The verse play entitled Paris and Helen: an Entertainment, dedicated by the author, Mr. Schwartz, to Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, contains some of the flattest lines that I have ever read. Verse fulfils, or should fulfil, the function of an intellectual and emotional shorthand; Mr. Schwartz writes verse that reminds me of Victorian calligraphy, thick on the dramatic stroke and thin on the lyrical. He has, however, the unusual virtue of a sense of decorum, so conspicuously absent from the contributions of, for instance, Paul Goodman, who seeks to achieve his effects by an erratic posturing of the first person singular. Finally, this notice should not be concluded without a palm being handed to Georg Mann for his story on Azeff Wischmeier, the Bolshevik Bureaucrat. It is brilliant satirical fireworks. GEORGE BARKER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IN BRIEF

MODERN BATTLE. By Major Paul W. Thompson. W. W. Norton and Company. $2.75.

"Modern Battle," twelfth in a series of short military books put out by Norton, performs a distinct service for the general reader. Frequently the civilian never knows what happens during a given battle. Censorship interferes with full accounts at the time, and later, interest does not justify attempts to resurrect the past, even in cases where the facts have become available. By extensive rummaging in foreign publications, mainly German, Major Thompson has reconstructed clear and non-technical accounts of fifteen engagements in the present war, each of which he treats in a chapter. The main campaigns covered are those in Poland, France, and the Balkans. Despite its distinct virtues, his volume has a number of the shortcomings common to war books. Comparatively few military men possess the knack of writing interestingly, and Major Thompson is not one. Moreover, only battles on land are treated, and in these air power is viewed as a purely auxiliary force. Finally, though the book is newly off the press, all events touched on are at least a year in the past, and some of the most interesting and vital campaigns of the war receive no mention.

DEARLY BELOVED. By Harry Sylvester. Duell, Sloan, and Pearce. $2.50.

An earnest but inconclusive novel about the Jesuit brotherhood in a Catholic community in Maryland, where the economic and social relations between Negroes and whites furnish a burning problem for an idealistic churchman to try to solve. Though the plot seems somewhat tailor-made to fit the author's indignant thesis, it is a sincere attempt to dramatize a worth-while issue: the church's regretful inability to remedy the cleavage between Christian doctrine and Christian practice.

SHAKESPEARE WITHOUT TEARS. By Margaret Webster. Whittlesey House. $2.75.

Some years ago Granville Barker demonstrated that a producer of Shakespeare may get a point of view from which things unnoticed by the critic or scholar become very plain. Miss Margaret Webster has the benefit of considerable experience in staging the plays, and as a result has a good many interesting things to say. Occasionally she rushes in where most of us fear to tread, as when she disputes with W. J. Lawrence about Elizabethan staging or with the fantastically technical editors on the subject of folio readings versus those of the "good" quartos; but even here she is worth examining, especially when she declares that her own experience has shown that the folio readings are often more speakable than those of the quarto. "Shakespeare Without Tears" is intended as a sort of introduction to Shakespeare for the general reader or the prospective auditor, but the point of view is always that of one who asks first how anything will work out on the stage.

PUBLISHED THIS WEEK

The Roots of National Socialism. By Rohan D'O. Butler. Dutton. $3.

Your Business Goes to War. By Leo M. Cherne. Houghton Mifflin. $3.50.

The Complete Poems of John Donne. Packard. University Classics. 95 cents.

The Axis Grand Strategy: Blueprints for the Total War. Compiled and Edited by Ladislas Farago. Farrar and Rinehart. $3.75.

Our Enemy Japan. By Wilfred Fleischer. Doubleday, Doran. $2.

Paddy the Cope. An Autobiography by Patrick Gallagher. Devin-Adair. $2.50.

Grass on the Slag Heaps: The Story of the Welsh Miners. By Eli Ginzberg. Harper. $2.50.

The Royal Road to Romance. By Richard Halliburton. Pocket Books. 25 cents.

Your Children at School: How They Adjust and Develop. By Elizabeth Vernon Hubbard. John Day. $2.75.

Action on All Fronts: A Personal Account of This War. By Ralph Ingersoll. Harper. $3.50.

The Actor's Art and Job. By Harry Irvine. Dutton. $2.50.

The American Cowboy. By Will James. Scribner's. $2.50.

The Urge to the Sea: The Course of Russian History. By Robert J. Kerner. California. $2.50.

The Valor of Ignorance. By Homer Lea. Harper. $2.50.

Guerrilla Warfare. By "Yank" Levy. Penguin Books. 25 cents.

New Soldier's Handbook. Penguin Books. 25 cents.

Mediterranean Front. By Alan Moorehead. Whittlesey House. $2.75.

The Pocket Book of Vegetable Gardening. By Charles H. Nissley. Pocket Books. 25 cents.

Pictures in the Hallway. By Sean O'Casey. Macmillan. $2.75.

What's That Plane? The Handbook for Practical Aircraft Identication. By Walter B. Pitkin, Jr. Penguin Books. 25 cents.

Indians of South America. By Paul Radin. Doubleday, Doran. $4.

New Hampshire Borns a Town. By Marion Nicholl Rawson. Dutton. $3.50.

Pygmalion. By Bernard Shaw. Penguin Books. 25 cents.

America's Strategy in World Politics. By Nicholas John Spykman. Harcourt, Brace. $3.75.

Blue Ridge Country. By Jean Thomas. Duell, Sloan, and Pearce. $3.

Financing the War. A Symposium Published by the Tax Institute. $2.50.

The Private Reader. Selected Articles and Reviews by Mark Van Doren. Holt. $2.75.

Four Years of Nazi Torture. By Ernst Winkler. Appleton-Century. $2.50.

Russia's Economic Front for War and Peace. By A. Yugow. Harper. $3.

DRAMA

A New Theory for J. M. B.

ACCORDING to his official biographer, J. M. Barrie thought the dream in "A Kiss for Cinderella" the best single scene he ever wrote, and so far as I am concerned there can be no doubt that it is at least the best thing in the not too happy revival of the play at the Music Box Theater. But as the same biographer admits, the piece as a whole is only for those who admire its author's famous sentiment so unreservedly that it cannot be laid on too thick to suit them, and perhaps I find the little girl's vision of what a royal ball would be like genuinely amusing just because it seems rather more in the manner of Lewis Carroll than in the manner of Barrie and hence furnishes almost the only relief in a two-hour stretch of sweet pathos and coy humor.

I doubt that I should ever know just how to take the very insubstantial story of the fabulous little waif who, in the midst of a previous world war, stole planks to make boxes in which to keep orphans, and I should not know how to take it partly because the waking scenes are almost as dreamlike as the dream itself, and I have no way of knowing what relation to reality they are supposed to bear. Nor does the present production give me very much help, since the star, Luise Rainer, is, to put it bluntly, obviously miscast. To begin with, her accent is so thick that she is, at times, quite incomprehensible, and she seems, in addition, to be the cause of incomprehensibility in others. Even Ralph Forbes, whose Policeman is certainly the best-played role in the production, sometimes requires the closest attention if one is to understand what he

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is saying, while Cecil Humphreys as Cinderella's artist employer talks so persistently into an invisible beard that one can, half the time, only guess at the gentle amiabilities he is supposed to be scattering. Nor is indistinctness of articulation the only reason why Miss Rainer is hardly qualified for the role, since if Maude Adams was right for it she is certainly wrong. There is in her too much of the spitfire and, in general, too sharp and rebellious a quality to suit with an atmosphere as relaxed as that which Barrie's all-pervading sweetness tends to create. Obviously the whole production has been mounted with care, but it fails to cast any adequate spell. Perhaps it will appeal to those for whom Barrie needs to be given only half a chance, but if he is ever to come back as a generally popular playwright I suspect that it will be only via better productions of other plays—plays in which he less obviously abandons himself to the very tendencies which only devotees can admire without strong reservation.

As the play unfolded and I realized with increasing alarm the strength of my own resistance to so much sweetness and light on the stage, I evolved a theory to justify what might appear to be a curmudgeonish attitude. And since the theory is brand-new—or let us say, rather, as new as anyone can reasonably expect a theory to be when it concerns a field over which Aristotle, Freud, and William James pioneered—I hereby offer it freely to such members of the public as may need to be reassured against the fear that a distaste for Barrie can mean only a heart of flint. Here, then, it goes:

To begin with, one must remember that there are two hypotheses, represented respectively by Plato and Aristotle, concerning the effect upon human conduct of what one sees represented on the stage. Plato's is simply that we tend to imitate the passions and the actions which we see represented; Aristotle's is, on the contrary, that that is precisely what we tend not to do. What we experience imaginatively is purged away, and that is of course why tragedy properly deals with evil passions and crimes, the impulses toward which are, as it were, ritualistically exorcised. Now I should like to go farther and propose what seems to me a very reasonable corollary to Aristotle's theory. If emotions experienced in watching a representation are not encouraged but got rid of, then it would seem obvious enough not only that evil passions should be represented on the stage but also that good ones should, on the contrary, not receive too full a ritual expression. And yet that is exactly what kindliness, generosity, and general benevolence do get in the works of Barrie and the other sentimental dramatists from the time of Sir Richard Steele down to the present. Even the most naturally generous man, the most universal lover of his kind, might have little benevolence left over for practical application for some time after he had been the victim of a purging as drastic as that which "A Kiss for Cinderella" administers. And now that I come to think of it, I do indeed remember that J. M. B.'s adoring biographer admits that his hero's generosity was highly capricious and that he boiled with indignation when the income-tax office finally compelled him to pay what he had for years failed to contribute. Perhaps comedy is the proper place for realism, cynicism, malice, and wit. Perhaps the place for benevolence and love is the active life.

JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH

RECORDS

COLUMBIA places first on its March list the performance of Beethoven's Piano Concerto No. 5 (known as "Emperor") recorded by Serkin with the New York Philharmonic-Symphony under Bruno Walter (Set 500, $5.78). In the first movement Serkin places very well—with power, with fire and excitement. But even in this movement I prefer Schnabel's playing in Victor Set 155—for the greater power that he achieves with the calm of maturity; also for the hair-raising tensions that he builds up and releases in the passage of ascending and descending octaves in the development section (side 3); also for the unsentimental expressiveness in the quiet passage that follows these octaves and in a few other such passages, in which Serkin's playing recalls the remark that someone told me Toscanini had made to him about Walter: "When he comes to something beautiful he melts." In the second movement the difference is more considerable: Serkin's bumpy phrasing sounds like that of a clumsy-fingered pupil, after Schnabel's with its continuity not only in rhythm but in mere physical sound. And in the third movement the principal theme as Serkin plays it has nothing of the dynamic quality which Schnabel's sharply contoured and inflected statement gives it; quieter pass-

HITLER QUAILED
when this man spoke!

With courage bordering on the divine, Martin Niemoeller defied the threat of a Nazi concentration camp, with its bludgeons and leather whips which flog into strips every kind of force, however manly, and reduce it to a heap of whimpering pain.

He defied Hitler by preaching Christianity to plain people who came to hear him on bended knee in a country where God is an outcast!

Learn *why* Hitler secretly fears this former U-boat commander, now turned pastor. The Fuehrer isn't even mentioned by name, YET HITLER TREMBLED WHEN NIEMOELLER SPOKE!

You will find this courageous book a reservoir of renewed faith and renewed strength to carry YOU through the dark and dismal hours of the anguished night ahead.

GOD IS MY FUEHRER
by Martin Niemoeller
Preface by
THOMAS MANN

REINHOLD NIEBUHR, *in The Nation, says:* "Martin Niemoeller, who sits in prison on Hitler's explicit orders even after a Nazi court declared him innocent, will undoubtedly be known as one of the heroes and martyrs of this period. . . . His 'sermons' breathe a religiously exalted defiance of tyranny. . . . To read this book with understanding is to know why the blood of the martyrs has been the seed of the church in all generations."

DR. CHARLES S. MacFARLAND, *Secretary Emeritus, Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, says:* "Should go into the homes of all who seek to penetrate the deeper meaning of the contemporary tragedy in Germany."

HARRY HANSEN, *N. Y. World-Telegram, says:* "Many honest Germans must pray for the welfare of Pastor Martin Niemoeller, the man who stood up against Hitler and redeemed the Church before the world."

DR. JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *in the New York Herald Tribune, says:* "Martin Niemoeller might have avoided trouble. He had only to be tactful and above all to keep silent. But like an earlier and greater Martin, Niemoeller felt himself under the command of conscience. He could not do otherwise than speak. . . ."

NOTE: *Not one cent of the royalties from this book goes to Germany.*

SEND NO MONEY!
Mail This Coupon Now to
THE PHILOSOPHICAL LIBRARY, Dept. 21, 15 East 40th Street, New York City
Please send me "GOD IS MY FUEHRER" by Pastor Martin Niemoeller, with preface by Thomas Mann, for which I will pay postman $2.75 and a few cents delivery charge.
Name.....
Address.....
☐ To save money enclose only $2.75 with this coupon, and book will be sent postfree.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ages again are sentimentalized by Serkin as they are not by Schnabel; and that episode in the development in which three times the principal theme begins expansively and then is brought to the same bustling conclusion hasn't the humor in Serkin's performance that it has in Schnabel's. I would, then, choose Schnabel's performance in spite of the mediocre orchestral framework; and if I wanted more distinguished orchestral playing I would take Columbia Set 243, with the orchestral part played by the Vienna Philharmonic under Walter, and with Gieseking's performance of the piano part, which is sensitive and suave not only where Serkin's is powerful but where it is sentimental or bumpy.

Another reason for these preferences is the recorded sound of the new Serkin-Walter version. Toscanini's 1936 recording of Dawn from "Götterdämmerung" reproduces the real sound of the New York Philharmonic-Symphony—among other things the dark color and richness of the low strings, the depth and body in the sound of the kettledrum, the deep-plumbing massiveness of the sound of the full orchestra. On these new Columbia records the sound of the orchestra is voluminous but flat, with none of that depth and body; the kettledrum is wooden; the cellos are light in color and nasal in quality; and even the voluminousness that is impressive at first gets to be noisy and confused and unpleasant. And in addition there is the noise and grit of the surfaces, with a periodic sputter on one of them. I have been speaking of what the records sound like on large wide-range machines with light, sensitive pickups; on a small machine of limited range with a heavy pickup the sound is more agreeable, but that sputter remains. The recorded sound of the Schnabel performance in Victor Set 155 is balanced and clear, natural and easy to listen to; that of the Gieseking-Walter performance in Columbia Set 243 is a little less good in these respects.

The depth and body and other normal characteristics of an orchestra's sound that I mentioned before are to be heard in Columbia's recording of the performance of Debussy's "Iberia" by Reiner with the Pittsburgh Symphony (Set 491, $3.68). Its one fault is that when the volume is set correctly for the loud passages it is incorrect for some of the soft ones. Thus, at the beginning of the last movement what should be the soft, distant sound of the flute passage of the second movement (marked *pp* and *encore plus lointain* by Debussy) is loud and near; the twenty-two measures in which the first movement dies out are also too loud and near; and I could cite other instances. The performance is good; the work is one of Debussy's most marvelous scores; the set, therefore, is a must.

Only one of Victor's February orchestral recordings has arrived so far: Strauss's "Rosenkavalier" waltzes, performed by Ormandy in an exaggerated Viennese waltz style that is as ludicrous as it is tasteless (18390, $1). And as it happens the only other February item that I can report on is the complete recording of Chopin's Waltzes played by Brailovsky (Sets 863 and 864, $4.50 and $3.50). The best known of these pieces are quite charming; the few that are rarely if ever played—Op. 69 No. 2, Op. 70 Nos. 2 and 3, each on one side of the three records in Set 864—turn out to be uninteresting. Brailovsky's performances are in the affected, capricious, and sentimental style that most people think proper for Chopin; and they are recorded with excellent fidelity to timbre, but with occasional rattles, and with several crackling or gritty surfaces in my review copy.

The way of playing Chopin that most people think proper and I do not is to distort the shape of the piece in order to exaggerate its emotional content. The way of playing him that I think proper and most people do not is one in which emotional insight operates through, and is restrained by, a sense for plastic coherence in form. And this way was heard in Webster Aitken's magnificent performances of the Twenty-Four Preludes at his recent Town Hall recital—magnificent as forms in sound, and through these as poetic communications. Aitken's recitals are occasions at which he presents to the public whatever music has occupied his mind; and in the past this has been matters like Beethoven's "Hammerklavier" Sonata, Bach's "Goldberg" Variations, Schubert's Sonatas. But this time he turned out to have been absorbed in four arid little Duets of Bach, in which his phrasing was exciting for itself; and in Debussy's Twelve Etudes, which were the occasion for a display of stunning pianistic eloquence in a vacuum—the musical vacuum of those elaborations of Debussyan idiom and style. On April 15 at the Y.M.H.A. this eloquence will be displayed in music more worthy of it—Beethoven's Sonatas Op. 28, 81a, and "Hammerklavier."

B. H. HAGGIN

CONTRIBUTORS

DONALD GRANT is a fellow of the Nieman Foundation for Journalism at Harvard University.

MAURICE FELDMAN, Austrian economist and journalist, lived in Scandinavia for some time before coming to this country and has since kept in close touch with affairs in that part of the world.

ROLFE HUMPHRIES has recently published a book of verse entitled "Out of the Jewel."

KATHERINE ANNE PORTER is the author of two distinguished books of short stories, "Flowering Judas" and "Pale Horse, Pale Rider." Her first full-length novel, "No Safe Harbor," is scheduled for spring publication.

ALEXANDER KIRALFY, an authority on military and naval strategy, will soon publish "Victory in the Pacific: How We Must Defeat Japan."

LOUIS B. SALOMON, a member of the English Department of Brooklyn College, reviews fiction regularly for *The Nation*.

INFORMATION FOR SUBSCRIBERS
THE NATION, 55 Fifth Ave., New York. Price 15 cents a copy. By subscription—Domestic: One year $5; Two years $8; Three years $11. Additional Postage per year: Foreign, $1; Canadian, $1. The Nation is indexed in Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature, Book Review Digest, Index to Labor Articles, Public Affairs Information Service, Dramatic Index. Two weeks' notice and the old address as well as the new are required for change of address.

Speak . . . read
JAPANESE
CHINESE, SPANISH, RUSSIAN
Quickly, Easily, Correctly
The Linguaphone Method enables you to speak any of 29 languages—by LISTENING to voices of native teachers in your own home. Amazingly simple, thorough, sound; no smattering. SEND FOR FREE BOOK.
LINGUAPHONE INSTITUTE
3 R.C.A. Building, N. Y. C. • Circle 7-0830

REST,
SPORTS,
RECREATION
available at nearby resort establishments advertising in
The NATION
For information, turn to the resort columns on the inside back cover.

Coming Soon in The Nation
"The Nazi Underground in South America"
by Hugo Fernandez Artucio
Reviewed by William L. Shirer

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Letters to the Editors

Dr. Niebuhr on the Jews: First Honest Analysis

Dear Sirs: I wish to congratulate you on the publication of Reinhold Niebuhr's articles, Jews After the War, in your issues of February 21 and 28. They are the first utterance in any American magazine that attempts a profound and honest analysis of the problem instead of indulging in flattering generalities. It is my conviction that an article such as this does more toward the solution of so intricate a problem than a dozen interfaith meetings.

DR. JOACHIM PRINZ

Newark, N. J., March 2

In Brandeis's Footsteps

Dear Sirs: The publication of Reinhold Niebuhr's Jews After the War was a noteworthy event. It is heartening to know that a distinguished spokesman for genuine American liberalism understands the essence of the Jewish problem. Liberal and progressive Americans honor the late Justice Brandeis, and it is encouraging to note that they are also willing to accept his basic conception of Americanism and to support the cause of Zionism to which he was so zealously devoted.

LOUIS E. LEVINTHAL, President,
Zionist Organization of America

Washington, D. C., March 1

A People Needs a Country

Dear Sirs: . . . I was particularly gratified to find in *The Nation* an unbiased and correct appraisal of the Zionist movement by a Christian authority who has earned for himself an enviable reputation as a great thinker, philosopher, and logician. . . . It is high time that the voices of liberal opinion in America should cease treating the Jews as a religious sect which in a free and democratic world is entitled to "toleration."

[illegible]ny casual survey of recorded history reveal them as a distinct ethnic [illegible] or people. As such they must a base or homeland of their own [illegible]t as other peoples have, without prejudice to their rights of citizenship in any other country of their birth or adoption.

I have read much in *The Nation* about the anticipated post-war settlement in which Poland, Norway, Denmark, Belgium, France, etc., will be resurrected. This, of course, is elementary justice. But no such settlement will have any permanent value in the society of the future unless the Jewish question is dealt with realistically, and Jews too are treated as a people instead of as refugees.

ADALBERT FREEMAN

Atlanta, Ga., March 5

Zionism a Counsel of Despair

Dear Sirs: Dr. Niebuhr deserves, and doubtless will receive, many thanks from Jews for his sincere effort to provide a solution for the vexing Jewish problem, but in his eagerness to lay that famous ghost he seems to have simplified the question too much and to have provided a confusing and inadequate answer.

The desirability and possibility of a settlement of Jews in Palestine was demonstrated before the rise of Hitlerism. That scourge has made the Jewish National Home a crying need. The establishment of a strong, populous Jewish settlement in Palestine will be one of the first and most urgent tasks of civilization after the war.

But will it provide a solution for the Jewish problem, which is fundamentally one of the relationship between Jews and non-Jews? The principal tenet of Zionist philosophy is that the attempt to solve the cluster of problems—social, economic, political, psychological, religious, and so on—arising from this relationship has been an absolute failure; that those problems can only be solved by the removal of the Jews to a place where they can be by themselves. This fundamental faith denies any possibility of solving the Jewish problem outside Palestine. Yet the problem itself is based on the assumption that relationship between Jews and non-Jews is not only possible but unavoidable, and that the home of the Jews is the place of their birth or adoption. The success or failure of Zionism, therefore, has little bearing on the Jewish problem.

Assuming that one million or two million Jews can be settled in Palestine after the war, how will that solve the problem of the other fourteen or fifteen million Jews in the rest of the world? Will Dr. Niebuhr contend that anti-Semites in the United States, Germany, and Poland will be less virulent if they know that Jews have a home of their own in Palestine? Would not the reverse be the case? Would not the successful removal of several million Jews from their native homes be rather an encouragement to the anti-Semites to increase their activities? That is what actually happened in Poland before the war; the success of the Zionist experiment spurred the Polish anti-Semites to a more intensified campaign.

I am not advancing this as an argument against Zionism. Anti-Semites will never be satisfied no matter what the Jews do, but by the same logic, the success of Zionism cannot possibly affect the position of the Jews in the diaspora. The sphere of Zionism is Palestine. There it has done and is doing excellent work, but when an attempt is made to apply Zionist principles and philosophy to Jewish life outside Palestine, the Jewish problem is complicated, not solved. Dr. Niebuhr's articles are excellent proof of this. He is clear and convincing so long as he argues for the establishment of a National Home in Palestine or elsewhere, but he becomes obscure and highly confusing as soon as he tries to apply his nationalistic principles to Jewish life outside Palestine, for instance, in the United States.

One gathers from Dr. Niebuhr that Jews in America, as elsewhere, are a distinct social group, unmistakably different from the larger American group by reason of some mysterious qualities which cannot be clearly stated because they are neither cultural, religious, nor racial alone. In fact, Dr. Niebuhr tells us that it is not only futile but wrong for American Jews to try to sink their group differences in the larger American culture. They render no service either to democracy or to their own people by doing so, he says. It appears that what used to be known in former days as Americanization is a cultural vulgarity and almost an ethical offense if practiced by the Jews. Yet Dr. Niebuhr does not seem to find anything wrong in the same process going on among other nationalities in the United States. The Jews alone seem to be sentenced to a kind of eternal cultural and spiritual isolation, from which they can escape only by removing themselves to a place of their own in Palestine, or in some other place—perhaps Madagascar.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

One is somehow depressed by such a statement despite the terms of ultra-modern and super-refined liberalism in which it is couched. And no wonder, for there is a distinct echo of racialism in it, even if the racialism is named "cultural pluralism."

It is understandable, even excusable, for Jews in the face of their present tragedy to lose faith in humanity and to wish to slam the door on the world. But for non-Jewish liberals to offer such counsel of despair to the Jews as a solution of their problem is very disheartening. WILLIAM ZUCKERMAN

New York, March 2

The Jewish Will to Survive

Dear Sirs: Dr. Niebuhr's article was like a clear strong wind blowing away the cobwebs and the musty odor of a house long closed to air and sunlight.

"Those Jews who do not feel themselves engaged by a collective will to live have a perfect right to be so disengaged," he says. No liberal Christian will challenge that, nor will the Jew who recognizes "Jewish nationality [as] something more than race and less than nationhood" be able to deflect the instinct of assimilative annihilation among those others. But history tells a tale of the Jewish mass will to survive, and for millions of Jews Zionism is the expression of that will.

Granted that in another civilization or perhaps in an advanced phase of our civilization the Jews might survive as a nationality scattered among nations, it is nevertheless tragically unrealistic to offer that solution now. Dr. Niebuhr is both realist and scholar when he states that he regards answers to the Jewish problem which do not take basic ethnic facts into consideration as expressions of a premature universalism.

ROSE L. HALPRIN

New York, March 4

Mr. MacDonald Objects

Dear Sirs: As a *Nation* contributor and an old friend and admirer of Victor Serge, I'd like to be allowed a few comments on the exchange between a group of Mexicans and German refugees, several of whom are known Stalinists, and the editors of *The Nation* which appeared in *The Nation* for February 28.

The letter attacks in violent language Richard H. Rovere's article in a recent *Nation* exposing the political motives behind the charges, made chiefly in Toledano's own paper, *El Popular,* that five left-wing refugees in Mexico are Nazi agents. The letter repeats the charge and refers to "proofs" that are alleged to be in the hands of a committee of the Mexican Congress. Although the letter does not even hint what these "proofs" are, and although Rovere is an assistant editor of *The Nation,* the editors of *The Nation* reply in effect by washing their hands of the whole business. One of the five refugees under attack, Gustav Regler, is strongly indorsed; another, Victor Serge, is less positively indorsed; and the other three are abandoned under the rubric: "We cannot answer for the character of all the persons who have been under attack in Mexico."

On February 9 a letter signed by 200 prominent Americans was sent to President Camacho demanding that he afford protection to the five refugees. That letter did "answer" for the anti-fascist character of these men. "It is a matter of public record," it said, "that all of these men have for years been active anti-fascists." Among the signers were Governor Culbert Olson of California, Thomas Mann, Dorothy Thompson, Matthew Woll, David Dubinsky, Freda Kirchwey, and four other editors of *The Nation.*

Now, am I right in assuming that what is at issue is not the general political beliefs of these refugees but certain specific charges of past and present collaboration with the Nazis in Europe and now in Mexico?

The letter from Mexico implies that anyone who opposes the present war is an agent of Hitler. With consummate tactical skill it refers only once to the issue—are these men the "shock troops of the Nazi fifth column" as charged?—and devotes most of its space to attacking their line on the war. It's not at all clear to me whether *The Nation* accepts this reasoning or not. Its apparent change of heart about these refugees implies that it does, since the letter from Mexico adduces no evidence that Serge and his partners are "Axis agents" beyond their alleged general political attitude toward the war.

It seems to me important for all of us who are still concerned about political morality to become clear on this. Does one or does one not become a tool of fascism, in *The Nation's* eyes, if one opposes the present conduct of the war as imperialistic? Can liberals still distinguish between Nazi agents and revolutionary working-class socialists? At the very moment that Gorkin, a former leader of the P. O. U. M., for example, is being slandered by his Communist opponents as a Nazi agent, fourteen leading members of the P. O. U. M. have just been condemned by a Vichy court to years of imprisonment at hard labor for "having maintained or reformed in France a political party capable of injuring the safety of the French state." *The Nation* has made its attitude toward Vichy clear enough. Is it willing to believe, on the mere word of his bitter political enemies, that a leader of a group even now being punished for "injuring the safety" of this Nazi stooge regime, that such a man—whatever one's political disagreement with him—is likely to be an Axis agent?

DWIGHT MACDONALD

New York, March 1

[Since this letter by Mr. MacDonald voices a point of view expressed by several other friends of the refugees under attack in Mexico, it is evident that *The Nation* did not make its position clear in the answer to the protest from Mexico. This time we would like to be as explicit as possible and then drop the subject for good. *The Nation's* answer was not intended to "cast suspicion" on Gorkin, Pivert, or Muniz. Our purpose was to insist for a second time that men should not be threatened or attacked for their political beliefs. We cited specifically the records of Serge and Regler for two reasons: first, because we know both men well enough, either through their work or personally, to be able to judge at first hand the character of the charges leveled against them; and, second, because their public support of the war against the Axis itself contradicts those charges.

Mr. MacDonald asks whether we believe that one becomes a tool of fascism "if one opposes the present conduct of the war as imperialistic." This is a political catch question. *The Nation* itself, supporting the war from the start, has frequently criticized the way it was conducted. The real question is whether a person becomes a tool of fascism if he opposes the war itself—not merely its "present conduct"—as imperialistic. To that question our answer is yes.

Fascism asks no more of anyone th
opposition to the war as an imper
adventure. Nevertheless, a tool
an agent, though Mr. MacDonald s
to use the words interchangeably. T
attitude and activities of these men do
not make them "Nazi agents" or justify
threats against them or attacks upon
them by Communists.—THE EDITORS
OF THE NATION.]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED